THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCIII.] NOVEMBER, 1861. [Vol. XVII.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, OCTOBER 14, 1861.

BY REV. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A., PRINCIPAL.

There are two tendencies powerfully at work in the present day, both referring to religion as their common subject, and each having a worth and significance of its own, which are nevertheless often considered antagonistic, and the results of which, it must be confessed, are not at first view always easy to reconcile. There are, first, the men of action and feeling, weary of controversial strife and longing for some positive, substantial faith, who want a religion that comes home direct to men's business and bosoms, and attests its origin by its effects; who care nothing for evidences and theological theories, and are willing for the sake of peace to acquiesce without question in the traditional formulas of their own church, if they can find in them any elements of practical truth and any power of efficient religious influence. All that such men ask about a religion is, whether it works well—whether it meets and satisfies a great social want. Besides these, there is a smaller but not uninfluential class, who cannot be content to leave the deepest interests of the human soul so entirely in the dark; who are driven by a sort of mental necessity to trace back effects into their causes; who demand a reason for their belief—such reason, at least, as the nature of the subject admits; and who do not stop in their search for it till they are cut short by the impenetrable mystery which envelops, and ever must envelop, the fundamental laws of being. With such men truth is everything. They regard it as treason to truth to think about consequences. When they have discovered as much truth as lies within their reach, and thrown on their mortal pathway as much light as suffices for their own guidance and inward peace, they conclude that their task is done, and, without troubling themselves about the popular faiths, acquiesce in the result. The question at issue between these two parties, apparently so much at variance, is complicated by their usually acknowledging in common a historical religion like Christianity,—which possesses a vague though unquestioned authority for the one, and furnishes a point of departure for the researches of the other; but which, so far from exhibiting any

one and explicit statement of divine truth upon which a man can at once put his finger and say, This is the gospel,—has its root, its manifestation and its development, in a multifarious literature of most diversified authorship and date, ranging over more than a thousand years, and conveyed in two languages, belonging to a different human family and of most opposite genius, a thorough mastery of which demands the unintermitted study of years. Out of this mass of writings, rich in the profoundest utterances of intuitive wisdom and prophetic insight, the popular instinct has drawn almost unconsciously, at the bidding of the voice within, the elements most needed for comfort and direction in life,—not, indeed, always independent of sanctions tinged by the superstition of the time, and sometimes attached to the gratuitous assumptions of a metaphysical theology, but still conveying, in spite of a large adhesion of dry husks, no small amount of spiritual nutriment to the soul. Unfortunately, though perhaps inevitably, the husk and the grain have been so constantly swallowed together, that the popular sense is unable to distinguish them, and thinks the one as wholesome as the other. And now comes the difficulty, when those who will think and must inquire, begin to perceive the vital distinction as yet unfelt by the vulgar,—the distinction between the living word of God, "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," and the dim cloud of human speech through which it burns its way—the gem bright with "the sapphire blaze" of the living throne, and the framework of perishable clay in which it is set; see clearly enough, that the historical rind, which left to itself would naturally burst and give way, instead of sheltering, by artificial compression stifles and dwarfs, the fruit within; and yet often find to their cost, that they cannot, even in the pursuit of the most obvious truths, effect the separation between them, needful as it is to mental growth and expansion, without wounding the religious sensibilities, and in some cases, where there has been any roughness or irreverence in the operation, without seriously damaging, at least for a season, the religious convictions of multitudes. "Why disturb foundations," says the practical philanthropist, "on which so much peace and hope, so much virtuous motive, depend?" "What is faith worth," replies the scholar, "where the foundation is unsound? Is it really instructing the people, to give them untruths or half-truths, instead of undoubted facts and absolute verities?"

To adjust the claims, apparently so incompatible, of these two parties,—to reconcile the demands of practical religion with the results of honest and fearless research,—to find out the point of their just equilibrium, where they will rightly balance each other and keep either extreme from undue exaltation,—is the great religious problem of the day, growing out of the crisis which

the irresistible progress of human ideas has brought on, and which no momentary compromise with immediate difficulties, and no adroit evasion of the whole truth, can permanently arrest or set aside. In the momentous character of the consequences involved in its practical solution, this question transcends in importance and interest any of those which for three centuries past have engaged the common thought of the scholar and the philanthropist.

As a contribution towards arriving at some intelligible conclusion on the subject, and no unsuitable introduction to a new session of philosophical and theological study, I shall attempt in a few words, as best I may, to shew, that practical religion, the religion that lies closest to the immediate demands of the conscience and the life, can only be rescued from doubt and fear and placed on a solid basis, by pursuing the researches of the scholar with perfect honesty into all their consequences, even should some not inconsiderable errors be evolved in the intermediate process; and that, on the other hand, the facts of daily observation and experience, with the inner witness of all humble and pious souls, are not less wanted as a limit and direction to the thoughts of those who hunt for truth in old books and deep theories, or desire to look on her face in the pure and still air of abstract contemplation.

The theological scholar, then, who comprehends his vocation, must, I maintain, hold himself bound, not by intellectual pride, but by the truest piety, to be honest, courageous and outspoken; for he has taken on himself the service of the God of truth. Enough light has already spread through every region of society, in countries like our own, to make even the unlearned, if they reflect, fully aware, that statements are constantly put forth with a show of confidence by the professional expounders of religious truth, which rest on no satisfactory evidence and are beset with the gravest difficulties, and that these things are slurred over or kept in the background, because they cannot be defended and explained. A more unhappy relation between the teacher and the taught cannot well be imagined. All moral influence is lost from the moment it is suspected that the authority to which submission is demanded, stands on hollow ground, and that public instructors either do not know the whole truth, or if they know it, will not declare it. Doubt and difficulty are mischievously exaggerated in this state of suspense. What is unknown or dimly seen, is supposed to be greater than it really is. The same objection which, candidly stated and explained with simplicity as far as it admits of explanation, would fall harmless on the inquiring mind, and leave untouched the great fundamental truths to which it may outwardly be attached, will prove in the highest degree noxious and destructive when it breaks all at once on a state of opinion wholly unprepared for its reception, and

carry with it for a time into common ruin the practical convictions with which it is intermixed. From this perilous contingency there is no escape but in the simple honesty of those whose high function it is to search for the truth and to deliver it. Often, indeed, they will have to confess their ignorance and their inability to answer the questions put to them. But acknowledged participation in difficulty by those who are looked up to as wise and instructed, deprives that difficulty of half its force, and tempers the painful feeling of disparity between the learned and the unlearned, by a reconciling sense of our common human limitation. It is well that the unwise should learn from the wise, how little we know and ever can know on earth, of matters which transcend our sphere of present experience, and that it is not the least valuable part of knowledge to discern its impassable boundaries.* Pride of intellect, a charge often vaguely hurled about by those who are themselves the most obnoxious to it, is usually the vice, not of knowledge, but of ignorance; for it is by our knowledge that we measure our ignorance. We are enveloped in mystery; it is the superficial, not the profound, who think they can dissipate it. "I cannot resolve in my mind," said that great naturalist, the late Edward Forbes, "the many queries which the consideration of the most insignificant of organized creatures suggests, without feeling that the rejection of a mystery because it is a mystery, is the most besotted form of human pride." †

Over and above these general considerations, which go to shew that in religion, as in everything else, straightforward honesty is the wisest and safest policy, I have further to remark, that in the present rapidly advancing state of scientific inquiry, it is hardly left to our own choice to be outspoken or disingenuous, and that the resistless logic of facts will compel us to let out the truth, whether we like it or not. Christianity is not an insulated phenomenon in the history of our race. Its roots spread far and wide in the language and literature of many lands and remote times; so that whatever modifies our view of the past, must proportionally affect our conception of Christianity. Thoughtful study of it as a vital element in the development of humanity, runs out into many closely-connected branches of knowledge, which cannot be controlled by the fears or the prejudices of the theologian; and among these are some, which have sprung into existence, and others, the primary conditions of which have been almost revolutionized, since the days when the standard defences of the Protestant faith were put forth. And can the ideas which

* At sunt vestiganda quædam, sunt et decernenda quædam. Non abnuo. Sed e diverso permulta sunt quæ rectius sit omittere quam inquirere. Et scientiæ pars est quædam nescire, permulta de quibus salubrius est ambigere quam statuere. *Erasmus Dorpio.*

† Quoted in his Life by Wilson, p. 548.

constitute Christianity, remain stiff and motionless, while the ideas which grow into them and out of them, are full of life and action? Is the one spot in the whole range of human thought to which our deepest interest and reverence attach, to be struck with barrenness, while all around it is blossoming and bearing fruit? If the theologian would fain keep it so, the secular intellect will wrest it from him, and assert a nobler divinity than his. Geology was unknown when Scaliger and Usher wrote, but it has for ever swept away the bases on which their elaborate systems are built. Humboldt's Kosmos cannot by any ingenuity be strained into accordance with that view of the physical universe on which the whole biblical representation rests; but it is founded on demonstration, and commands in its grand outlines the assent of the entire scientific world. These things are not theories, but facts —facts of which the popular intelligence is every day becoming more fully possessed. And if facts, it is impossible to evade them; they must be accepted and explained. Indeed, with regard to physical phenomena, we have already almost reached this conclusion. Even among conservative theologians it is not unusual now to make a distinction between moral and physical truth, and to admit, that while it is the object of the Bible to reveal the former, it does not profess to teach the latter. This is a part of the truth; but a thorough investigation and honest statement of all the facts of the case will carry us much further than this limited exposition of it. The physical sciences have, it is true, experienced an immense expansion within the last half century; but their fundamental data, as determinable mainly by the relations of quantity, have undergone, as they could undergo, no essential alteration; for wherever the mathematics have sway— and their despotic rule seems continually on the increase through the entire realm of matter—they fix beyond the reach of subsequent disturbance the groundwork of human knowledge. But of the sciences which relate more immediately to human nature —language, mythology, ethnology, and the deeper criticism of history, literature and art—it is not too much to affirm, that the assumptions on which they were once undoubtingly rested, have broken down, in some cases have utterly perished, under the weight of a profounder and more searching investigation; and these are precisely the branches of knowledge which must of necessity exercise the directest influence on the interpretation of the Bible and our conception of the religion which issues from it. Men's ideas of Deity and their modes of worship have been shewn by a large induction of facts, ever to bear a certain relation to the capacity of the language they speak, to the idiosyncrasy of race, and to the modifications which result from the intercourse of different races with each other; and generally it is demonstrable in regard to all races, that their religious ideas pass through certain stages of progressive development, beginning with a sensuous

fetischism, growing up into symbolism or a nobler anthropomorphism, and refining themselves gradually through metaphysical hypostases and apocalyptic imagery into spiritual convictions. History proves this to be so invariably the case, that we can hardly refuse to accept it as a law of human development; and not only have we no right to assume beforehand that the history of a particular people would be exempted from its operation, but the very records which that people have left of themselves, bear the distinctest traces of its working. Of the religious conceptions of a people in each of these stages of development, their rude monuments and oral traditions—what in time becomes their art and their literature—are the natural, and in one sense the unconscious manifestation.

I need not here assert, because by those who know my real sentiments I shall be understood to assume and acknowledge, the pre-eminent susceptibility of the Hebrew race, above all other peoples, to the higher inspirations of religion, and the function assigned them by Providence through the consummation of their spiritual economy in Christ, of revealing one living God of love and holiness to the world. It is more pertinent to my present object to observe, how our conception of this, the greatest fact in the moral history of our planet, must be affected by the new light shed on all those sciences with which the right interpretation of the Bible is inextricably involved; and, while we handle that venerable book not with less, but only with a more intelligent reverence, how widely our conclusions respecting it must often deviate from those who assume it to be a work of one quality throughout,—who suppose its letter to contain strict historical fact and absolute spiritual truth from beginning to end, —who think it possible to prove, and even make its acceptance depend on the proof, that all the separate books of which it consists were written by the authors whose names they bear,—who repel with a kind of pious horror the intrusion of myth and erroneous speculation, of mistaken chronology and uncertain authorship within the limits of the sacred text,—who cannot, in fine, reconcile the ideas of progressive spiritual development and intellectual limitation with that of a divine revelation,—who insist on God pouring his whole truth into the mind all at once, instead of gently infusing it as he strengthens the spiritual organ to receive new light. These assumptions on which the popular theology rests, not only cannot be proved, but are capable of positive disproof; and they who cling to them in spite of evidence to the contrary, endanger the whole authority of scriptural religion by staking its credit on the maintenance of their groundless prejudices. I do not know that we can more adequately describe the Bible than as a national literature, collected, guarded, and in some portions revised, by the religious conscience of a peculiar people. And let not that word literature deceive us. The

same words mean very different things at different times. Literature now is not the same thing that it was in its origin and rudiments. With us, literature in all its forms—the production of a book—is perhaps the most distinct and emphatic expression of self-consciousness that we can imagine—the deliberate surrender of a portion of our inmost soul to our fellow-beings—pre-eminently a moral act, fenced in by the innumerable obligations and liabilities which grow out of the refined and complicated relationships of our Christian civilization. But literature (if we may use the word of mental products before the general use of writing) in its origin was less an act of determinate aim, than obedience to a simple instinct; and the deeper the feeling out of which it sprung, the more unconscious was its working. At first, scarce any intellectual element was involved in it. It was the omnipresent Spirit using the soul of man as its natural organ. The heart of primitive humanity burst into song as freely and as abundantly as the birds in spring. These utterances carried with them no feeling of personal distinction or personal responsibility. The rights and the duties of authorship were then alike unknown. Joy and sorrow had a natural language of their own, which belonged to the tribe and not to the individual, though one voice might be prized above the rest for its strength or its sweetness. The consequence was, that the simple poetry and rude chronicles of early times were regarded very much as a common property and a joint inheritance, over which the tribe or family had an absolute control, and which might be enlarged or abbreviated and continually re-cast, with the retention of the old name, without a thought of invading literary property or violating literary honesty. These ideas belong to a far later day. For ages a sort of literary communism prevailed. Bards were incorporated in guilds. There were schools of poets as well as schools of prophets. Even of the great Homeric poems all scholars know how difficult it is to prove the historical authorship; and in the form in which we now possess them, they have undoubtedly to some extent been modernized and interpolated. It is true, when books were multiplied, and learning became a pursuit, and literature a profession, the old ideas underwent a change; and in the Alexandrine period particularly, when libraries were first collected, intentional fraud was often practised, and books were fabricated under false titles to procure a sale or to recommend particular opinions. Such practices, however, were exceptional, and condemned even then. Still among writers of the highest class the old feeling so far subsisted, that the literary inheritance of the past was regarded in some sense as a common property, which might be freely used for any purpose that seemed conducive to the instruction of the present. History, for instance, was written less perhaps to describe events as they actually occurred, than for the sake of the moral lessons which it was fitted to yield. Plutarch's

Lives—one of the noblest products of the religious wisdom of heathenism—strongly betray this didactic tendency; and the speeches put by the greatest ancient historians into the mouths of statesmen and generals, probably originated in a similar desire. Keep this distinction between the literary feeling of ancient and of modern times clearly in view, and you will see how unreasonable it is to apply our modern standard of judgment to works produced under such different circumstances, and from a moral point of view so opposite to that which is recognized by us. You will perceive that the credit of the Bible, and the authority of the religion which it reveals, are not upset by the discovery that the authorship of particular books is uncertain or wrongly assigned, that the form in which we now possess them is probably not that in which they were originally put forth, or that all the words and events recorded in them are not strictly accordant with historical fact. Criticism has gained an insight into the laws which governed the genesis of the most ancient literature, and we are not justified in demanding that one book should be an exception to all the rest. What we want is evidence of simple, ingenuous utterance, of faithful record of the actual belief and conviction of the time, of unconscious witness to the working of God's Spirit in the hearts and lives of men. The individual authorship of books is, in this view, of less importance than their issuing out of the bosom of a particular society and expressing with unconscious truthfulness its indwelling spirit. The depth and richness of a divine revelation are manifested in its influence on many minds of various temper and capacity,—in its imbuing them with a common feeling, and giving them a common aim and impulse,—not in its authoritative utterance by one, where it must be limited by the intellectual peculiarities of the individual. Hence the advantage of a religious literature over a single religious book. Hence the transcendant superiority of the Bible to the Koran. We have the literature of the prophetic age in the Old Testament, and that of the apostolic age in the New; and we find in their respective literatures the clearest internal evidence how deeply the Spirit of God was working in both. We know now, from principles not gratuitously assumed, but deduced from undoubted fact, under what conditions all religious history is developed, and what phenomena we may expect to meet in it. That these phenomena occur in our Bible is no argument against its religious worth in the view of any right-judging man, but rather a proof that it can be no subsequent fabrication. We are not at liberty to accept the doctrines of Niebuhr and his school in relation to all other history, and deny their application to that of the Jews. Nor is it any refutation of the principle involved in them, to be able to shew that various theories framed in accordance with it are wrong in detail. The grand problem remains unaltered in all its essential conditions, whatever may become of

any attempted solution of it. That the date and authorship and original form of many of our sacred books are very uncertain, that they exhibit on some points conflicting and irreconcilable views, that there is in all of them a mixture of the divine and human, and that the outline of actual history is here and there dimmed or hidden by a veil of mythic conception,—these are facts which no one of competent knowledge will venture in the present day to deny, however De Wette or Vatke or Strauss or Baur may be shewn to have failed in explaining them; and they are the facts on which a criticism at once reverent and free must continue to employ itself, if we are to have a clear faith and an intelligible Bible. Fear nothing, then, from thoroughly honest discussion. Two facts stand out, like granite peaks, in the dim ocean of the past, against which the tornados of scepticism and the surges of criticism beat in vain—that wonderful religious teaching by Hebrew prophets, to which heathenism furnishes not even an approximate parallel, and the mysterious spiritual phenomena which break in on the world's history at the commencement of our era, and which are wholly inexplicable except on the supposition of a Christ, such as the Gospels disclose to us, as their centre and source.

Of the criticism which we are compelled by scientific honesty to adopt, there is yet another view to be taken, which will place its results in a different light and recommend them to the practical religionist. At first sight its processes appear simply destructive. But of what are they destructive? Not one of the grand spiritual truths of which the Bible is the vehicle and by which the souls of men are truly nourished, is touched by them. On the contrary, they are conservative of what is religious as distinct from what is merely historical. By shewing how the two elements are related to each other, how the one is subject to the unvarying laws of human development and could not be exempted from them without losing all evidence of past reality, and how the other comes direct from the Source of spiritual light, yet can only flow into our world through a human channel,—it enables us to cast aside with indifference, or to regard simply with an antiquarian and scientific interest, the old husk which once protected the fruit, and still serves to shew where and when it grew, and to enucleate for our use in a purer state the precious contents which it has brought us. And is not the recognition of this distinction, which a conscientious criticism actually forces on us, a positive relief to many a pious Christian—who has been constantly distracted by the most conflicting emotions in the indiscriminate use of his Bible, as much repelled by some passages as attracted and awed by others, and who has often been afraid to put the whole Scripture into the hands of his children, lest they should light on texts which might disturb the peace or stain the purity of their minds? Let us accept, then,

with gratitude this inevitable result of true learning, that the religion of the Bible is as distinct from its history, as matter conveyed is from its vehicle,—and the obvious inference from it, that in our public teaching they should be kept apart. We shall enter with a fuller and more unhesitating joy into the Psalmist's rich gush of devotional fervour, when we can see in the darker hues of vengeance and hate with which it is so constantly dashed, only the faithful reflection of peculiarities which grew unavoidably out of his stage of social advancement and the temperament of his race. We shall contemplate with purer delight the healing beneficence of Christ, when we are no longer perplexed by his doctrine of demoniacal possession. The great idea of a kingdom of God will not be the less but the more full of spiritual meaning and encouragement drawn from the deepest springs of eternal truth, when we perceive that it has gone through all the phases of national development, that it has been realized to each successive generation through the beliefs that were familiar to them, and that to the last it was mixed up with mistaken expectations, and calculations of time that have proved erroneous. Our souls are nourished by the truth that is universal and everlasting, not by ideas that are local, transitory, perishable. These criticism bids us drop, as of the past; while it preserves to us the former in undiminished, nay, in augmented strength. It takes away from our religion what only deadens and encumbers it; and by the same process, which is at once destructive and conservative, it deepens and intensifies and brings out more clear and bright and strong, that inner faith of the soul by which alone we truly live.

I have attempted to shew, that a freer criticism of our sacred writings, like that which is now applied by scholars to all other ancient books, is not only a necessity forced on us by the present condition of all the related branches of knowledge, but a process yielding results which are really conducive to the interests of pure and spiritual religion; and that consequently the practical and religious reformer, instead of gratuitously raising a fruitless antagonism against the critic, should rather endeavour to find out what is his true relation towards him,—should accept with a generous trust in truth what he has proved can be no longer denied, and work amicably with him in adjusting the moral perceptions of the Christian world to the new points of view under which science has irreversibly placed some of the old objects of Christian faith. On the other hand, the practical Christian will not be the receiver only in this intercourse. He will give back to the theological scholar quite as much as he receives,—results of observation and experience amidst the every-day realities of life, without a constant reference to which the mere student of books will be sure to go astray in his speculations, and often abuse a sound criticism to an absurd conclusion. To find out

the whole truth, the men of theory and the men of practice must help each other. The physical sciences have for many years acknowledged this; and the reports of the British Association shew what splendid fruit has sprung from the connection. Why should religious inquiries be any exception to the general rule? From their nature they ought to benefit by its application above every other subject of human thought; for they deal not with questions to which only a superior intellect is equal, but embrace those grave inward realities which affect our nature through all its grades of development, and to which the universal experience of mankind bears witness. The free, unprejudiced scholar who would reduce the biblical statements to their true significance, and sees in them only an intenser manifestation of spiritual laws which are everywhere and always in operation,—he is not the obstacle to a full recognition of the value of this alliance between theory and practice, but the orthodox theologian who, by making God's dealings with men in Scripture something wholly exceptional, shuts them out from the witness of subsequent experience, and deprives the Bible of the strongest proof of its conveying a message from God. How grand and consolatory, rather, is the reflection, that the same God who spake to prophets and apostles in ancient times, still has access by his Spirit to our hearts, and breathes into our deepest consciousness the same convictions and trusts of which their recorded words are a solemn utterance! We know that they speak the truth—we recognize in their words the Word of the Living God,—from our own feebler experience of kindred visitations, and our instinctive reference of them to a Divine Source. We, like the men of old, are burdened with the sense of infirmity and sin; we, like them, long for spiritual redemption, and sigh after that eternal life which is only to be found in peaceful communion with God. The same words which comforted and strengthened them, comfort and strengthen us, and by working in us a godly sorrow, put our souls, like theirs, into right relationship towards God. We are raised into a new life by those who are spiritually stronger than ourselves. It is the law of our human development. But to apprehend what they bring to us, we must possess the same spiritual organs and have intuitions of primal truth fundamentally the same with theirs. The truths of which they are the vehicles, will then only the more strongly impress us—from the very distance at which they are delivered to us—from the venerable histories in which they are wrapped up—from the examples of heroic or saintly excellence in which they are expressed.

Now to feel all this, and to find it in the Bible, we must bring to it some spiritual experience; we must not come to its pages with an empty heart and a torpid conscience, but already know something of religion as a reality within ourselves. Not without reason did the old divines insist on prayer and faith and a holy

life, as the conditions of theological insight. You cannot attain theological truth in its widest and noblest sense by the intellect alone. To the young men who this day resume their course of philosophical and theological study within these walls, or engage anew in the introductory discipline which is to prepare them for it,—I would say, if you wish to know the whole truth of God, seek not to be scholars only, but religious scholars. Cultivate the religious life. Do not be ignorant from personal experience of the greatest realities of your being. Have an eye ever open to the deepest wants of humanity, and ask yourselves constantly how they are to be met. Study, as you have opportunity, records of the experience and labours of holy, devoted and self-denying men, who have lived in close communion with God and dived deep into religious experience, and been successful in reviving the languid piety and building up anew the decayed religious life of their time. This is profitable reading for the future teacher of religion; for it supplies the facts which must be made the postulates of every living theology, and may help to counteract the somewhat arid and consuming effect on the mind of continual engagement with historical criticism and abstract speculation. Shall I be thought to wander from my proper subject, if I add finally, cultivate an acquaintance with the great poets of all ages and imbibe their living thought? Next to the Bible, great poets are the best interpreters of the spiritual mystery of human life. They lay open the recesses of the soul, and betray its deepest needs and utter its sublimest aspirations, and in their highest strains are not distinguishable from prophets. Enriched with spiritual knowledge from all these sources, your mind will be prepared for the successful study of theology, and you will have firm hold of the primary assumptions on which, if it is to have any solid basis, theology must rest. The spiritual sense thus formed within, will furnish an unerring test for the discrimination of the human and the divine in the words of Scripture: at its touch the former will precipitate itself as a mere historical sediment, while the latter will be at once disengaged from it as a pure and vital element. In this way the claims of a scientific theology and practical religion will be best reconciled.

To blend in candidates for the Christian ministry a free spirit of theological inquiry and the solid learning which is its indispensable instrument, with religious earnestness and the power of effectually communicating religious truths and impressing religious convictions, is the main design of this Institution,—a design in closest connection with the great demand of our time, but the complete fulfilment of which in all who aim at it is not so easily attained. The conditions which must combine to the formation of an accomplished religious teacher, have relation to different mental aptitudes, and have too often been developed apart. We have had learned theologians who were no preachers, and eloquent

preachers who were no theologians. Without attempting to efface the original differences of individual character, which would in itself be an evil, is it not possible to unite the two characters to such an extent as to meet more adequately than we have hitherto done, the growing want of society,—the want at once of intellectual light and spiritual fervour? All science is beginning to expound itself to the popular ear—to gather round it a group of eager listeners, as well as to lay profound treatises on the solitary student's desk. Theology, which is the science of religious truth, if it would keep its hold on the general mind, must follow the same course. We are but reverting to the practice of antiquity, the final object of whose scholastic discipline was to make men speakers. I would say to the young men who now hear me, As you would fulfil the special mission of your age, and not study in vain, cultivate the gifts of utterance,—learn how to clothe your thoughts in clear, manly, persuasive and energetic speech. Remember that truth loses half its value when disjoined from the power to impart it. I know how little mere rules and discipline can effect for this purpose; and were they ever so effective, of themselves they could only produce a cold, artificial result. True eloquence must come from the soul within, and every one who is thoroughly in earnest, has his measure of it. Think, then, of the work to which Providence has summoned you. Think of its nobleness. Think of the great and good men who through all time have been associated with you in it,—striving to build up God's kingdom on earth. Reflect that for this end your knowledge of languages and your acquaintance with science and philosophy have been acquired, and consecrate them to its attainment. Think of the purposes of good that may be excited—of the dark prejudices that may be dispelled—of the hindrances to mental and moral advancement that may be removed—of the deliverance from doubt and fear and misery that may be effected for thousands—by your religious use of the intellectual powers which you are here cultivating, and of the literary treasures which you are here heaping up,—think of this, keep this end of your work ever in view,—and it will give you a heart to feel and a tongue to speak, and your heart speaking through your tongue will not speak in vain.

Perhaps there never was a time when there was a stronger call for a ministry at once enlightened and devout, at once instructed and earnest, and when before such a ministry there lay a clearer prospect of doing good. I have pointed out some of the qualifications for such a ministry, and urged our young friends to cultivate them. Shall I be considered as stepping beyond my sphere, if I venture to say a word to congregations, and to tell them, that they too have their duties as well as those who minister to them, and that they must lend their aid in calling forth such a ministry as the present state of the world requires? How

are we to draw the best and noblest minds into it? What is the chief function of a minister of religion? Till that is distinctly apprehended, duties on both sides will be misunderstood, and there will be mutual dissatisfaction. That function, if I rightly apprehend it, is to nourish the religious life of the world by the earnest enforcement, under all their aspects and in all their applications, of the great truths which express the eternal relations of the human soul with God—truths on which the soul's spiritual growth essentially depends, but which the pursuits of the world continually hide from its view. He must of course take part with those around him in the practical work of a Christian church; but his proper business is to study for others' benefit truths of the highest order and shew their endless applications to life. He must undertake no work that would oblige him to neglect this. He cannot else be an effectual preacher of Christianity. If, then, you appreciate his peculiar work, if you feel its importance, and desire it should be done well, three things you must keep in mind in respect to your minister, especially when he is young. First, you must not overtask his powers. If his mind is not to be prematurely exhausted, you must leave him leisure for study, for collected thought, for mental refreshment. Spiritual fruit, worth the raising, cannot be exacted in ever-recurring measures from the mind, like mechanical labour from the hands. A practice more destructive of all vigour and freshness of thought could not well be devised than that of demanding from a young man two written compositions every Sunday, with perhaps occasional services during the week. It is surprising that so much sound intellect as still exists in the pulpit, should have survived such a process. When complaints are made of the dulness and monotony of sermons, the question may well be asked, how much of this may not be due to the unreasonable demands of the congregation? One discourse well thought out and carefully put together is as much as even a strong mind can furnish week after week, and not even that without occasional intermission. The whole of Sunday need not be devoted to the formality of preaching. There is room and demand for a familiar teaching of first principles to the young and uninstructed, conveyed in plain and extemporaneous language, which would often beneficially replace the languid performance which is called a second service, and in preparing for which by close and consecutive study the minister will enrich instead of exhausting his mind. I believe this over-demand of original composition to be a great evil in the present constitution of our churches, which if not remedied will have the effect of deterring the best minds from their service. Secondly, sympathize with your minister in all his earnest aspirations after higher truth. Do not watch every fervent utterance of his soul with sectarian suspicion to find in it some lurking taint of heresy.

Let enthusiasm for whatever is right and noble, and Christian indignation against all falsehood and wrong, have their free course. Do not tie him down to your own intellectual standard. Demand only evidence of seriousness and devotion and the fervour of a pure mind. A wider manifestation of this trustful, catholic spirit in our churches would do far more than subtle disputes about doctrines and evidences, to draw the best minds into their service, and to strengthen our spiritual bonds with the many searchers outside who are looking for freedom and know not where to find it. Thirdly, do not be regardless of your minister's temporal comfort. If he loves his vocation, he will not need to be attracted towards it by the prospect of wealth and worldly distinction. He will find it to a large extent its own reward. But if you really value his work, it is only reasonable that you should secure, as far you can, the conditions of its efficient performance. You must know, that mental efforts worthy of the cause of Christ cannot be produced under care and despondency, in the absence of the comforts and decencies of life, and amidst the anxieties which wait on an insufficient or precarious income. If the Christian ministry be really a noble and dignified vocation, and should be supported accordingly, there is something in the present state of our social relations which needs rectification in this respect. In many wealthy families a cook or a butler who ministers to our lowest animal wants, is more liberally remunerated than those whose professed office it is to satisfy the hunger and thirst of immortal souls.

I say these things in no captious or querulous spirit, but simply to mark emphatically the character of our time. The question was, how we can call forth such a ministry as the age requires; and in attempting an answer, it was necessary to state without reserve the conditions essential to its production. I am far from being unhopeful about the future. On the contrary, I do not know that I ever commenced a session in better hope. We have this year a larger number of students than I can remember since my connection with the College. We do not admit indiscriminately all applicants; and those who have entered this session, give promise of ability and a successful career.

Of our undergraduates—students in the classes of University College—I am happy in being able to give the following favourable report. At the announcement of prizes and certificates in June last, their names stood thus.—*Mathematics, Higher Junior:* first prize, Mr. Jos. Estlin Carpenter, with a special commendation from the Professor at the time of its delivery; second prize, Mr. Richard Pilcher; fifth certificate, Mr. John Ainsworth; sixth certificate, equal with three others, Mr. David Ainsworth; seventh certificate, equal with one other, Mr. R. A. Armstrong. *Mathematics, Lower Junior:* first prize, Mr. Arthur Payne, equal with one other (the son of Rev. R. B. Aspland). *Latin Senior:* second

prize, Mr. J. E. Odgers; seventh certificate, equal with another, Mr. R. Pilcher. *Latin Junior:* first prize, Mr. J. E. Carpenter; third certificate, Mr. David and Mr. John Ainsworth, equal; fourth certificate, Mr. Ambrose N. Blatchford. *Greek Senior:* sixth certificate, Mr. J. E. Odgers. *Greek Junior:* prize, Mr. J. E. Carpenter; second certificate, Mr. R. A. Armstrong, Mr. J. S. Ainsworth and Mr. A. Payne, equal; fifth certificate, Mr. A. N. Blatchford; sixth certificate, Mr. D. Ainsworth, equal with another. At the first B.A. examination for honours, Mr. J. E. Odgers was bracketed in the first place with two others.

And now, to conclude this long address, let me say in two words, that looking out on the world around us, and considering the painful position in which many enlightened and truth-seeking men are now placed by their implied ecclesiastical obligations, I think we have reason to be satisfied with the free, unfettered Nonconformity which we inherit from our noble-minded forefathers. Only let us regard that freedom not as any merit of ours, but as a privilege and a trust which carries with it a corresponding obligation, and will disgrace rather than honour us if we do not honestly and courageously use it. Let all of us whose studies are carried on in this place, whether laymen or divines, understand the full value of that great principle by which, amidst our diversities of pursuit and destination, we are all here bound together in one generous communion of free thought and free speech; and by consistently acting out that principle in our conduct through life, let us prove to a distrustful world, how possible it is to reconcile a wise conservatism with healthy progress, and to combine the freest search after truth with the reverent humility of a pious heart.

PARAPHRASE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

FATHER, our Father, of all names the dearest,
That sounds the sweetest and that clings the nearest,
Who on Thy throne of radiant glory seated
Look'st smiling down on all Thou hast created,
To Thee ascend the grateful adorations,
The ever-mounting homage of the nations.
Thy kingdom come where'er Thy law is given;
Oh! be it done in earth as done in heaven.
Give us our daily bread; we would desire not
Superfluous luxuries that we require not.
Keep us from being tempted; but if tempted,
From all sin's evils may we be exempted.
The power, the kingdom and the glory Thine,
And ours to bow all-reverent at Thy shrine.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE—CANON STOWELL AND DR. BEARD.

The recent meeting in Manchester of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, has very seasonably given occasion to some of the ministers of religion in that city to consider the relation which religion bears to science, and their mutual influences on each other. Two of the publications issued on this subject are now before us: one by the Rev. Canon Stowell, M.A., containing two sermons preached in Christ church, Salford, which are severally entitled, 1, "Sound Science in Harmony with Divine Revelation, but utterly Insufficient without Revelation;" 2, "Sound Science ancillary to Revelation, but immeasurably Inferior:" the other by the Rev. John R. Beard, D.D., also containing two sermons, which are severally entitled, 1, "The Harmony of Religion and Science;" 2, "The Contrariety of Science and Orthodoxy."

It is curious and interesting to note the contrariety of spirit and argument which these publications exhibit when compared with one another. We will endeavour to set before our readers a summary view of both.

Canon Stowell begins with confounding revelation with its *records*, and then attempts the impossible problem, in which such multitudes before him have egregiously failed, and in which, from the very conditions of the problem, all who attempt it necessarily *must* fail, of exhibiting a perfect agreement between science and scripture,—regarding the latter, indeed, as declaring by anticipation the results of the most profound investigations of the former;—than which a more essentially *secularistic*, and therefore disparaging, estimate of the character and object of the sacred writings cannot easily be conceived. His illustrations of what he has asserted (p. 9), "that the word of God anticipated the discoveries of science, and indicated much that sages have made out only in modern days," are some of them ridiculous enough. Take, for example, his comment (p. 10) on Gen. i. 20: "Naturalists," he tells us, "have traced very clearly a close affinity between the fish of the sea and the fowl of the air; in their mode of respiration, in their internal structure, in their means and mode of movement, in many other details, they display a near relationship and indicate a common birth. Now on turning to [the] sacred record, what do we find? That as God commanded the waters to bring forth the fish, so he bade the waters bring forth fowl to fly in the firmament of heaven."

Now it is confessedly just conceivable that the original writer of this statement *may* have shared the opinion of many ancient philosophers, that water is the origin of all things, and so *may* have referred the birth of fowls as well as of fish to that element. But we do not ourselves believe that such was really his mean-

ing; or, if it were, he must have extended the affinity yet farther. Every one conversant with Hebrew will at once perceive that the translation which is given in the margin of our Common Version is of at least equal, if not (as we think) superior, authority. "Let fowl fly," &c. So writes the learned Dr. Alexander Geddes, *in loco:* "Those who have rendered, 'and flying creatures that may fly,' &c., making עוף the objective of ישרצו, have not sufficiently attended to the idiom of the original." Yet it is on this very questionable rendering that Canon Stowell founds his whole argument.

Not more successful is he in his attempt to shew that the Scriptures exhibit "the knowledge of the principle on which the world is retained in its place in the economy of the heavens" (p. 10). The Hebrew original of the 98th Psalm (we can confidently assure Canon Stowell, who seems to be quite incapable of forming any opinion on the subject himself) says nothing about *round* in connection with the world, nor even implies it; and as for the *circle* and the *compass* noticed severally in Isaiah and Proverbs (p. 11), we will leave him to settle with the mathematicians how these expressions can be regarded as "exquisitely descriptive of the spherical formation of our world!"

Canon Stowell next gives us (p. 12) the erroneous assumption of Archdeacon Pratt respecting the word translated "firmament" in Genesis i. 6: "The Vulgate and the Septuagint," writes Canon Stowell authoritatively, though he had just before implied that he is not himself acquainted with the original Hebrew,—"The Vulgate and the Septuagint mistranslate it. . . . . 'Firmament' is true to the misconception of the middle ages, but 'expanse' is true to the glorious original." The readers of last month's *Christian Reformer* will have already learned from the Strictures, by the Rev. Samuel Bache, relating to this very subject (pp. 590—594), how utterly worthless is this bold and unwarrantable assumption.

It is amusing to see how Canon Stowell (p. 30) condemns "some modern geologists" for questioning "the universality of the deluge;" and oracularly declares that "their arguments are alike scanty and superficial:" while his more modest and judicious contemporary, Canon Miller, acknowledges the conclusive force of these very arguments, and contends that the deluge of which we read in Genesis was not intended to be represented as universal. (See Bible Inspiration Vindicated, p. 68.)

Nor do we regard Canon Stowell's theology as one whit better than his science or his hermeneutics; nor do we believe that either of them could find much acceptance with any of the not merely honorary members of the august Association whose meeting in Manchester gave occasion for these sermons. We were startled and shocked, we must confess, by his exhortation to the philosophers (p. 6) "to bring all their treasures of discovery and

lay them at the feet of the once crucified and now exalted Lord of all." We could not but earnestly protest against the *supreme* importance which he assigns (p. 16) to the narrative in Genesis of what is commonly called *the fall;* as though the gospel of Christ were not sufficient, independent of that narrative, to teach us our relation to God, our duty and destiny. We might have suspected in any other connection a mere careless misquotation when we read (p. 18), in relation to the alleged blindness and scorn of philosophy and philosophers in regard to salvation, "Hearken to God's own report on the subject: 'After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching,'—or rather, as the Greek has it, 'the preaching of foolishness,'—to save them that believe." The quotation is of the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 21. What would the devout apostle have thought of hearing these plain words of his own simple narrative described as "*God's own report*"? He might well, indeed, have characterized such preaching (according to the version of the passage which Canon Stowell, in common with Mr. Belsham, adopts, except that the latter does not generalize it as Canon Stowell does both in word and deed),—St. Paul might well have characterized such preaching as "the preaching of *foolishness;*" for such, indeed, it appears to us to be, and of *impiety* into the bargain.

Of course we have the usual "foolishness" also of the demand for the submission, "not merely of the affections and dispositions, but submission of the mental faculties, the reasoning powers, with which God hath gifted man" (p. 23): and the usual confounding together of actually existing mysteries with mysteries which have no real existence at all, but are the offspring of a mere vain superstition. And, as the climax to this strange "preaching of foolishness," we have more than one express mention of the illustrious Newton, as though his principles and philosophy gave any sanction to the characteristic sentiments herein propounded, or as though his reverential humility had been the same thing as that *prostration of reason* which this "preaching of foolishness" recommends.

But enough and more than enough of this extraordinary production. We doubt not for a moment the sincere intention of Canon Stowell to *recommend* divine revelation to the reverential study and cordial acceptance of the illustrious cultivators of science then assembled in Manchester; but we cannot for a moment conceive that many of them, if any, could sincerely accept it on such a recommendation. For a recommendation in real accordance with their own sublime principles they must have gone elsewhere; nor would they have had far to seek. During the very same meeting, in another assembly of Christian worshipers, they might have heard a far more intelligent, philosophical, scriptural and sublime recommendation of divine revelation

than that which we have just examined. It is given in that other publication containing the two discourses by Dr. Beard whose subjects we have already announced. Of these discourses we must speak only very briefly, as we shall best serve the great cause of truth and the interests of both religion and science by inducing our readers to procure these admirable discourses and study them themselves, in order that they may not only discern but *feel* the harmony which really exists between the works and the word of God, and see and feel also how popular orthodoxy destroys this beauteous harmony.

This harmony consists in the very nature of religion and science respectively. "Rightly regarded" (says Dr. Beard, p. 7), "the two are one. Religion is the knowledge of the universe viewed relatively to its Divine Author. Science is the knowledge of the universe viewed relatively to its human interpreter." Hence he proceeds justly to argue, 1, that "religion and science are one in their primal source; for both, so far as they are true, are God's essential intelligence revealed to man." He next shews, 2, that they are "one in their seat in the human mind." "True science is a mirror of God." 3. "Religion and science are one in their objects." "God and the universe differ only as the one permanent Being differs from his variable manifestations." "Again, 4, religion and science are one in their proper aims. What are those aims? The knowledge of God and the service of man." 5. There is "a unity of operation between religion and science. In truth, their methods are the same." Whence, 6, "they are one also in their intrinsic results. .... Religion, disclosing man's relations with his Maker, teaches man how to please God in the performance of his duty. Genuine science, disclosing God's doings in the universe, teaches man how to please God in conforming to God's laws, and in keeping in agreement with the universal harmony. .... How is it [then] that history shews us [religion and science] so often in collision? I answer, the reason is to be found primarily in man's misconceptions of God. .... False religion, placing God above the universe, makes his appearance in human affairs an intrusion, and so repels science, which sees nothing but law, order and harmony, everywhere. Science is repelled, too, when religion declares the mind of man corrupt and unreliable; for the very basis of science is faith in human nature. But of all the errors by which religion alienates science, the greatest and the grossest is its doctrine of salvation by a creed" (pp. 14, 15). In conclusion, the preacher eloquently shews (p. 16) how "Christ is the harmony of the world; for he is at once religious truth and scientific impulse." Whence he deduces (p. 17) the "special reason" which "we, as Unitarian Christians, have for desiring the universal dominion of science. The reign of science is the reign of intelligence, and intelligence is the very sap and life of Unitarian Christianity. .... But here

comes into view a marked difference and a peculiar value of religion. The gospel, while it is an embodiment of God's love in Christ, addresses chiefly the emotional part of our intelligent nature. Satisfying every legitimate claim of the head, it has for its special duty to minister solace and strength to the heart. This it does in the person of Christ. Christ is the embodiment of the Divine goodness. . . . . Here science bows before religion. . . . . Yet science is by no means blind to the Fatherly character of God. Indeed, the highest scientific genius acknowledges, as if instinctively, the fatherhood of God as well as the brotherhood of man. Newton, the great patriarch of modern science, was a Unitarian alike in conviction, sentiment and practice. . . . . And here comes into view another of the instances in which science and religion are already learning to utter the same voice. Death in the view of Jesus is only a passing into life. And what is death in the view of science? Let the answer be given by one of its most competent interpreters: 'What we term death is a mere expression by which we signify a fresh form of life.' . . . . The indestructibility of forces is one of the great discoveries of recent science" (p. 18).

Not less powerfully does Dr. Beard set forth in the second of these admirable discourses the contrariety of science and orthodoxy. He shews how orthodoxy is unjust in its assumption of infallibility and its consequent endeavour to force its views on others. He contrasts with this presumptuous spirit of orthodoxy the sincere faith of the man of science, who "believes in truth, and so believes in God, the Author of truth; and so again believes in research, the way to truth, and progress, the condition and reward of truth" (p. 25). In farther illustration of this contrast, he shews, 1, how "the teachers of the law in the days of Christ denied the competency of the human mind for the acquirement of knowledge." He proceeds to remark that "this same condemnatory and exclusive spirit for many centuries kept the people of all civilized lands of Europe groping in thick darkness" (p. 29); and hence observes, "To this is it owing that science has in its phraseology so scholastic a character. . . . . A great benefit for the world would he achieve who should set science free from these rusty chains, and teach the phenomena of the universe to every nation and people in their own mother tongue" (p. 29). We doubt the correctness of this representation. We doubt, too, the benefit to science or to human life of rejecting what he designates as a "barbarous" and "difficult" tongue, which is, however, in an important sense universal in this western world, in favour of the separate mother tongue of every nation and people. We would respectfully commend to the attention of Dr. Beard in this connection, the admirable remarks on the increasing need of this classical language in consequence of the growing tendency to separate nationalities which

manifests itself among the nations of Europe, which he will find from the pen of the Rev. John James Tayler in an earlier number of the present volume, p. 529.

We are again in perfect agreement with Dr. Beard when he proceeds to shew, 2, that "the teachers of the law in the days of Christ had made the word of God of no effect by their traditions" (p. 30), and to draw out the parallel in modern orthodoxy; and when, 3, he traces this to a radically false mode of philosophizing. In like manner, he has our hearty concurrence in what he says, 4, of the iniquity of man-made creeds, and exposes the folly of compelling men in these days to take their science from a source acknowledged to be above three thousand years old. So, too, when he proceeds, 5, to expose the "marked divergence," if not "real contradiction," which orthodoxy exhibits in contrast with science on the subject of *morals;* and in conclusion, 6, to denounce the unlawful arts of controversy by which "orthodoxy still struggles to uphold its throne."

In the clear exposition and illustration of these interesting topics, Dr. Beard has rendered a most important service indeed to religion, to science, and to the scriptures of sacred truth, and has evidently himself felt the inspiring influence of his own enlightened and comprehensive survey. In one particular, especially, we have noticed with surprise and admiration the elevating reflex operation of his truly Christian earnestness on his own feelings and utterance. It is near the beginning of his second discourse (p. 26), where, having adduced, as a sufficient and decisive voucher for his assertion that the genuine spirit of science is the real spirit of the gospel, the memorable words of Jesus (John xix. 37), "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness to the truth; every one that is of the truth heareth my voice;"—having adduced this citation, he seems to have felt so deeply the power of this testimony of Jesus, that he breaks forth into direct and earnest prayer to Jesus as "the author and the apostle of truth;" thus bearing his personal testimony to the natural yearning of the Christian's heart, in inspiring faith and grateful reverence, towards Christ the Lord, and so neutralizing whole pages of learned dissertation in which he has recently attempted to disparage this genuine form of the religious sentiment, and denounced this natural manifestation of some of the purest and noblest promptings of devout and grateful affection. It is of the utmost importance, indeed, that this natural manifestation of grateful reverence for Christ should always be kept clearly distinct from that religious *worship* which is due to God alone. We see a danger here against which it is necessary that we be strictly on our guard; but we would not on that account renounce altogether the sentiments or the practice of which we have here an illustration; especially when, as in this case, their origin is so natural, and the

reference to Jesus as the head of his church exhibits him so clearly in subordination to the God and Father whom he revealed. It is *invocation*, not *worship*, which we would vindicate; and with regard to such invocation of Christ in Unitarian worship, we would respectfully recommend to Dr. Beard to qualify the strictures which he has published in recent numbers of the *Christian Reformer*, by a reference to the origin and spirit of his own beautiful prayer, with the quotation of which, as peculiarly appropriate to the subject before us, we will conclude this imperfect review:

"O blessed Jesus, the author and the apostle of truth, who camest into the world to reveal in thine own life the God who is truth itself, and so didst lay down thy life in attestation of thy fidelity to truth, and who now lovest all who, guided by thy spirit, make truth their sole and constant aim, and hope by ceaseless growth in truth to draw nearer to thee and to thy Father in the age that now is and in every coming age, —look down in pity on the outward form of thy church; see how for truth men, calling themselves thy disciples, enthrone their own opinions; and pour out upon them thine own most truth-loving and comprehensive spirit; so that we may no longer have reason to fear the application of thine own test, 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another,' but experience in its plenitude of good thine own promise, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free' (John viii. 32)."

To this prayer we are persuaded that all our readers will, like ourselves, respond with a devout and hearty Amen.

THE RELATION OF MIRACLE TO THE MIND OF CHRIST, AS ITS CHIEF PURPOSE AND DISTINCTIVE ARGUMENT.

Sir,

Amid much that is said of miracle, I wish to draw the attention of your readers to a view of it which I scarce ever find adverted to, but which I nevertheless think would go a great way to a better understanding and clearing up of the subject. It is the view of its relation to the character of Christ. While a great deal is urged for it as proof of divinity, attraction to a prophet, or divine mercy on mankind,—and all alike seem to have been powerless to prevent or repel objection,—the relation of it of which I now speak, equally forgotten by both sides in the controversy, might, I cannot but think, bring them at least nearer to mutual admission and agreement. The purposes of miracle, commonly urged as above, are all external; in each case the miracle proceeds from Christ,—has a bearing, not on himself, but on others. And although objections are for the most part such as are made to miracle altogether, I yet think that its rela-

tion to Christ himself, rather than in these its external aspects, would materially lessen, if not disperse, such objections. I say nothing now of what I consider the untenable position of objectors logically and historically considered. I simply give them what I regard a logical and historical view, as an aid, as I consider it, to a juster *presumptive* view of the case only.

I receive Christ, then, as historically presented to me. I can receive him in no other way, after every possible theory, process and consideration affecting the knowledge of him which we possess. I find him, then, in the midst of this power of miracle; or, for the sake of argument, I will even *suppose* the case alone: I will try it as a theory against what objectors have tried and maintained as theory. I believe my theory rises out of the facts; but let me waive that consideration awhile.

Christ is supposed to have exercised the power of miracle. Great and beneficent miracles are recorded of him. Great crowds pressed upon him in consequence. People thought that God was with him. Divine mercies streamed forth on suffering men. An unusual elevation of character distinguished the personage around whose path these effects followed,—a character of greatness, tenderness, perfectness, which has found a deep and wondrous reception with mankind. Perhaps this character has most impressed those who have been least disposed to attend to or accept the miracles, beneficent, like the character, though they were. Why this divorce of the two I do not now say. But we may be allowed to think that if there was something most unusual in the character, it was natural to expect something equally unusual in its accompaniments. Let us consider if there were not a very strict and intimate connection between the two.

Suppose that at a particular period and solemn occasion this power of miracle took possession of Christ: suppose that on feeling its first presence, its new and awful strivings, he is urged into solitude for repose, and the absence of any ordinary or additional occasion of duty and trial: suppose, further, that the presence of this new power with him only makes itself the more felt where, in the desert, there is nothing to call off the mind to other things, and that the very needs of the place become a temptation to him to employ it: suppose that the state of the public mind in respect of the personage whom he now knows himself to be, only becomes the more vividly impressed on his imagination, and that he even feels that he has just been expressly empowered of God to fulfil it: suppose that from the desert heights the prospect of Judea extends itself to that of the kingdoms of the earth, east and west, in his view, and that he feels that all their glory might instantly become subject to the command over nature and man with which he feels himself invested, and yet, notwithstanding, he immediately entrenches himself within the shelter of a divine moral law to which he

naturally, and by all the process of his religious education, owes obedience:—do we not at once see that within the confines of his spirit the greatest of results has been achieved,—that the ruling of his spirit, the denial of self, the resistance to action and prospect, even akin to right and virtue, but not of it, has made that spirit greater than all that it turned from, and that resistance to an infinite capability to seize them, infinitely raised that spirit above such as are tried only by ordinary finite capabilities? Suppose all this, and you have an example of the relation of the power of miracle to Christ himself, and the greatness of character that distinguished him: and is it not far before any other effect or purpose which can be discerned in it, inasmuch as it is a spiritual rather than a bodily or material good that is achieved by it? Suppose that throughout his life among men, as in this prelude to it in the wilderness, you find the same grand forbearance, must you not expect the same grandeur of result on the mind and character of him who exercises it; while the relaxing of this forbearance, and yet the constant pressure of the power on the faculties of judgment and will, in the case of its free and frequent exercise on others' woe, filled up with glowing and tenderest attributes the high-raised features of this infinitely-tried humanity,—a character thus, we may say, "perfected through suffering"? We say, then, bring these two phenomena together in this supposed mutual relation, viz., the character and the accompaniments of the Christ: it is very natural that we should; there they are, side by side, in what professes to be history,—is there not an intimate relation between them, and does not such intimate relation at once necessitate our reception of that history as true? Far more so than on the obvious and common notion that the miracles had nothing to do with the character, but were merely external proofs and manifestations of mercy.

Do we not also find in it a strict analogy with what we already believe to be the highest end of God in an ordinary providence, viz., the education, discipline and perfecting of the spirit of man, the greatest thing we know,—that in which divine tendencies and operations, so far as we see them ordinarily displayed, appear to culminate,—spirit being above matter, moral and intellectual beings above the outward universe? Such being the end of an ordinary providence, might we not expect that if any departure from an ordinary law took place at all, it would be for this highest end, not for anything less? I think, then, the difficulty of belief in miracle is lessened on this view as compared with the other. Moreover, if by such a departure, not only a higher degree of the great end is the result, but by means of it the great end itself in an ordinary providence receives a new impulse and becomes clearer and brighter,—in other words, that "many sons are called unto glory by a leader in such salvation being made perfect through suffering,"—shall we not have greater reason still to

accept this departure from an ordinary law? Shall we not, not only divine but believe, and, with all the powers of our understanding as well as the promptings of our moral nature, discern clearly this connection of the divine accompaniments with the inmost spirit and habitual character of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Further, if this be so, are there not some other conclusions and clearings up intimately connected with this?

First, it is obvious that a great historical and logical difficulty is removed from the path of those who profess to receive Christ without miracle. In receiving him so, indeed, they appear to accept a greater miracle, inasmuch as they receive an effect most marvellous and unparalleled, without being able to give any account of it, without finding any instrumental cause of so great a phenomenon. This difficulty vanishes, and a greater still, viz., that of arriving at any notion of Christ whatever, except as he appears indissolubly blended with the daily array of miracle, and life incident and character arising out of it, as recorded in the gospel page. On the other hand, accept this supernatural power within the sphere of Christ's own spirit as a capability of which he was ever conscious (and it is usual with objectors to outward miracle to place the supernatural within the region of the spirit, —to consider it as internally rather than externally manifested), and at the same time admit the highest end of God in its action on Christ's character, and it seems next to impossible not to admit, that while it generated a grand forbearance in respect of himself, it should also have flowed freely forth through the outlets of his human compassions, and dropped around in innumerable divine mercies on mankind; that is to say, that it had an external as well as an internal action.

And again: while this view may possibly assist a class of believers on one side of the line of the supernatural, it may perhaps also aid a class on the other side. In common speech, while it assists those who believe less, it may assist those who believe more. It may become to those who hold the deity of Christ the actual explanation and substantiation of their dogma: perhaps it is the tacit understanding of it, of which multitudes already are conscious,—the reason they acknowledge to themselves of the hope and faith that is in them. It may give them the exact scriptural view of the divinity, or, if they choose, deity of Christ,—viz., the divine power which came upon him at his baptism and the commencement of his Messiahship, rather than an additional nature which he possessed before; that his divinity or deity was not a separate nature, but an empowering, or opportunity of empowering, above ordinary humanity, which the vouchsafing of divine powers within the limits of his will afforded him,—became, in fact, the fruit and result of an extra divine discipline,—shone forth as the light of a human nature equal to the control of heavenly powers: so that, in eloquent language,

we may say, God sent forth his Son, thus, "the brightness of his glory and express image of his person." The common claimants of a divine as well as of a human nature for Christ surely forget that the human nature universally is itself divine, and requires not an arbitrary addition, but simply a nurture, growth, quickening and exaltation; and that by an extraordinary discipline and calling out—nay, by the opportunity of infinite trial and capability for the will—the perfect image of God in humanity may be the effect. Of one substance with the Father, thus, is the Son; and all sons, in their differing degrees. Is not this the genuine orthodoxy—that which the very Council of Nicæa decreed?*

Further: perhaps we may derive an additional argument for the view I am advancing from what appear to be the tendencies of the most advanced science. For if the view of the relation of the supernatural to Christ's mind be correct,—if it be, as we believe it to be, according to scripture and fact,—we distinctly see in it the subjection of the physical and material to the intellectual and spiritual power. Outward material nature obeyed his word. And it is a most remarkable feature in the Christian miracles, that it is material and physical forces that are changed by them—intellectual and spiritual, never; clearly shewing, as we should expect, the absolute immutability, inviolableness and supremacy of the spiritual. In the case of the restoration of disordered minds, physical causes were concerned. Observe, too, how in Paul's conversion outward miracle acted on his mind by his mind's inviolable law. In this majestic sway of the spirit, then, we take Christ, as in other attributes, so in this, to be image of the invisible God.† Nay, the very fact of the power which he held in sway is standing and everlasting proof of One who is above nature and all her laws, and who, in allowing them thus to be subject to a human will, made the revelation of all revelations—broke the dread silence—let there be light once more—from nature led us up to Himself.

Of what immense and unspeakable value, then, is the doctrine and fact of the supernatural in the gospel; and how much called for now that philosophers are either losing or seeking the bond between the material and the spiritual in the universe! It would seem, indeed, from the first to have been distinctively, purposely and solicitously set forth, as divine and merciful assurance amid the terrible sameness and awfulness of the powers in nature by which we are enclosed. Admit the subjection of the supernatural to the will of Christ, and you admit it as subject to the will of God,—much more, therefore, the simply natural: you

---

* See Stanley's Eastern Church.

† "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (John v. 19).

discern clearly God over nature, equally fixing or relaxing its law; or, if you choose so to consider it, revealing its higher law to his human offspring. On the other hand, the simple theist, already believing, already holding the bond between the material and the spiritual, affirming the subjection of nature to a divine will, may discern, if he do not yield to, an analogy between his own faith and that of the supernatural in the gospel; its subjection to the mind of Christ being of the same order of general truth as the subordination of the natural to the divine in the universe, which he himself admits.

With this I began, as I now conclude, my letter. If any further force, however, can be given to the argument for the departure from an ordinary natural law in Christianity, it will be found in its connection with that natural law itself as exemplified when the departure is alleged to have occurred; the actual state of the world, that is to say, under an ordinary providence, at the time this extraordinary provision professes to have occurred; not isolated, arbitrary, disconnected from human affairs and interests, but in their very heart and centre; blended indissolubly, as it would seem, on all sides with them; in the one great crisis of human history, the point at which special and particular histories meet; in connection with, and, as we allege, the very sphere of the nurture of, a character, of whom philosophy and religion alike may say now, as they did at the time it appeared, "Whom God hath made the heir of all things; to whom and not to angels He subjected the world of which we speak; through whom all things have been effected; without whom nothing has been done that hath been done;" "in whose name every knee will bow" in things pertaining to the highest interests of man.

Briefly recapitulating what I have said: the relation of the power of miracle to Christ himself, rather than to its external acts, diminishes the difficulty of belief in it, inasmuch as its spiritual reference and effect achieves a far higher purpose, and is in analogy with the highest end we know in ordinary life: it affords a very simple and natural explanation of the universally acknowledged superiority of character in Christ: it meets and satisfies what appear to be the inseparable historical conditions of the case: it reconciles on the one hand the simple theist, or one who professes to receive Christ without miracle, and, on the other, the believer in his deity, on the same platform of supernatural, unexaggerated, and, we think, alike religious and philosophic truth.

Finally, it solves the difficulty of science, in exemplifying the bond between a divine will and a natural law; a difficulty, perhaps the only difficulty, worthy of so great an answer. Add to this the great historical picture, the position which the manifestation of Christ occupies in particular and general history, and if anything can add force to the argument for a departure from

an ordinary divine law, this surely will. All natural law of providence was then seeming to converge to this centre, so as of itself to necessitate some divergence from it. Is it any wonder that supernatural light and power escaped?

Chief in this array of evidence stands, after all, the actual character of Christ. Human character in all providence being the great end of God, is it surprising that at such a crisis the action of supernatural power should have contributed to it,—nay, is it not necessary to account for it? Confessedly the most extraordinary character the world has yet seen, which even those who question the power the most eagerly accept, yet which finds in that power its just explanation in strict accordance with the scriptural account. May not all believers equally join in its sublime characterization—"It became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," the height of which they believe to have been the discipline of a human will in the divine sphere of an infinite capability?

October 4, 1861. J. H. Ryland.

REV. JAMES MARTINEAU ON THE HYMNS OF THE CHURCH.

Sir,

After carefully considering the whole of Dr. Beard's "hymnological" strictures, I find myself indebted to him for one correction, which I desire to acknowledge.

I had adduced Artemon as an early Unitarian witness to the divine honours rendered to Christ in the old hymns; though also to the existence, ever since the apostolic age, of a very different doctrine, truly humanitarian, in the ordinary language of Christian belief. His evidence thus served as a set-off against the later assertion of Paul of Samosata, that the hymns on the Incarnation were in his time recent innovations.

Now of this Artemon we know little or nothing except through a treatise (the "Little Labyrinth"*) written against him, and quoted by Eusebius in the chapter to which I referred. From this source we learn that, according to Artemon, the Unitarian doctrine prevailed at Rome till the time of Victor, the thirteenth Bishop; but that with the next Bishop, Zephyrinus, the tendency to deify Christ (θεολογῆσαι) gained admission. In answer to this allegation, three facts are appealed to as notorious, viz.,

(1.) That Victor himself, instead of favouring the doctrine, had banished the Unitarian Theodotus as a heretic from Rome:

(2.) That the divine nature of Christ had been taught by a series of eminent ecclesiastical writers long before Victor:

* This title we get from Theodoret, Hæret. fab. ii. c. 5, compared with the passage cited by Eusebius.

(3.) That it also found expression in the ancient psalms and hymns.

Our witness, therefore, to the character of these hymns is not Artemon, as I had said; or Eusebius, as Dr. Priestley says;* but the author of the "Little Labyrinth," as Dr. Beard remarks.

This author, however, is so obviously appealing to recognized facts, that I find them treated, by critics of the highest eminence, as admitted alike by Artemon and his opponents. Dorner, for instance, in his "History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ," says that Artemon "in effect retracts his charge of innovation by granting, what he cannot deny, that in old hymns the divine nature is already attributed to Christ; though he is of opinion that in the language of dogma his own" (Unitarian) "doctrine has had a co-existing and even prevailing place."† And again: "Paul of Samosata repudiated the hymns of praise to Christ under the pretext that they were of recent origin; a plea in flat contradiction to Artemon, who finds the divinity of Christ nowhere but in ancient poems, and not in the language of dogma."‡ And Schleiermacher, in an essay contrasting the Sabellian and Athanasian ideas of the Trinity, has the following passage:

"Soon after the first propounding of the divinity of Christ in strict didactic form, Artemon, from fear that it was an approximation to Hellenic modes of thought, set himself against the procedure as an innovation. For only in this restricted sense, as referring to the first beginnings of a more definite enunciation of doctrine, can we understand his complaint of novelty, preserved to us by Eusebius from an anonymous writer. It would imply an ignorance or a prejudice such as the testimony even of his enemies forbids us to ascribe to him, did he mean to deny the long-established use of such language both in hymns and in religious exhortations: it was only the more rigid formulas of doctrine that owed their germ to the published defences of apologists almost contemporary with Artemon. It is quite conceivable that, with his predominant tendency to the calmer, not to say colder, view of things, he might let such sentiments and phrases pass as innocent within the province of poetry, where the aim is simply to present and diffuse the inner religious feeling; yet would protest against anything of the sort on the exacter field of doctrinal statement, where the object was to fix a conception by precise definition. Supposing such poetical expressions to shew symptoms of encroaching on this stricter field, he might say, in spite of the earlier facts, that not till his own time had men begun to make Christ God. This view is favoured by the use of the word θεολογῆσαι, which has originally a special reference to this

* Hist. of Early Opinions, B. iii. ch. xv. sec. 1.

† Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lahre der Person Christi. Berlin, 1851. Band. I. S. 508.

‡ Ibid. S. 510.

stricter province. And we know from our authorities that Artemon laid great stress on the logical definition of religious terms, submitting even the contents of scripture texts to logical scrutiny before applying them to dogmatic use."*

These sentences, so apposite to my April letter, I had not seen when I wrote that letter. But having consulted both original sources and annotators together at a public library, I had apparently mixed up in my notes my own or some other secondary inferences with the first-hand testimony, in the same way that Schleiermacher and Dorner have done.

While I shall never excuse inaccuracy, in myself or in those whose merits can better cover it, I must remark that, though the name of our witness is changed, the *thing witnessed* (the character of the early hymns) remains unimpeached and, in Schleiermacher's view, unimpeachable, except by ignorance and prejudice too gross for a man of culture like Artemon. He might nevertheless have good grounds for asserting the prevalence *in* Rome of a Unitarian doctrine respecting Christ till the time of Victor: for the West did not lead, but follow, the growth of opinion: and it was no answer to Artemon to refer him to Greek and Eastern divinity and poetry marked by sentiments other than his own. The fact was undeniable and ancient; but did not displace the other fact on which he dwelt, viz., that in and from the time of the apostles, the Unitarian version of the gospel had also existed, and in Rome had maintained its ground till Victor's episcopate. Artemon, therefore, had as little interest as he had evidence, which could lead him to deny the early ascription of superhuman attributes to Christ in the hymns of the Eastern Church.

Having made this self-correction on a single subordinate point, I shall abstain from self-vindication on all the rest. From some unfortunate cause, I seem incapable of conveying my ideas to Dr. Beard; for by far the greater part of his strictures proceed upon perversions of my meaning, and apply only to positions and arguments with which I have no concern. It is discouraging enough to find through three-fourths of his discussion that I have failed to make myself understood: to complete my misfortune, I am myself unable to understand the remainder. The "statistics" of ἐπικαλεῖσθαι rather confuse than illuminate me; and "to call upon the name of Christ" still seems to me an act of invocation. In spite of the "*Dativus commodi*," the question comes back, If Pliny had wanted to say that the Christians sung a hymn to Christ as a god, how would he have expressed himself, *if not* by the phrase, "carmen Christo, quasi deo, dicere"? And even upon the hinge-point of the whole discussion,—How

* Abhandlung über den Gegensatz zwischen der sabellianischen und der athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinität. Sämmtliche Werke: zur Theologie. Bd. II. S. 490, 491.

are we to know prayer from apostrophe when we see them,—Dr. Beard's opinion remains for me completely in the dark,—neither defined in his exposition nor illustrated in his practice. To say, "All the invocations in *this* book are innocent apostrophes, and all in *that* are idolatrous prayers," may be serviceable as a practical rule; but it establishes no principle, and gives no result worthy of the apparatus of learning and the fervours of zeal. In truth, I believe there is no real difference of principle between Dr. B. and myself: and I have only to regret that he should be so anxious to establish one.

London, Oct. 18, 1861. JAMES MARTINEAU.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

IN the C. R. for October, we published the protest of a large number of Genevese pastors and professors against the exclusiveness of the *Evangelical Alliance*, as shewn in their projected meeting in Geneva. To this were added some spirited remarks by M. Athanase Coquerel the younger, one of the editors of *Le Lien*, from which paper we derived the Genevese protest also.

In *Le Lien* of Sept. 28 and Oct. 5, are notices of twenty pamphlets that were published in Geneva on the occasion referred to, from the very able pen of Stephen Coquerel, another of the editors. And (also under date of Sept. 28) is a lively and able article by Athanase the younger, in reply to the orthodox (?) editor of *La Revue Chretienne*, who thinks himself and his co-religionists aggrieved by hearing the Athanasian Creed quoted as an exposition of the saving faith. We now reproduce these articles, assured of their acceptableness to our English readers, as representing the view taken by liberal foreign Protestants of the proceedings of the so-called *Evangelical Alliance*.

(Sept. 28.*)*

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AT GENEVA.

1. Letter to M. J. Adrian Naville, formerly Councillor of State, President of the Committee of the Genevan Evangelical Alliance; by Hugues Oltramare, Prof. of Theol. and Pastor of the National Church of Geneva.
2. Geneva and the Evangelical Alliance. A Letter to Pastor and Prof. Oltramare; by F. Bungener, Minister.
3. Questions on occasion of the Evangelical Alliance.
4. An Answer to Questions relating to the Evangelical Alliance.
5. Rejoinder, with new Answer, to Questions relating to the Evangelical Alliance.
6. The Evangelical Alliance confronted with the Genevan Church (Extract from the *Disciple de Jésus Christ*).
7. Opinion of a Liberal Christian on the Evangelical Alliance.
8. The Great September Review.
9. Who are we? A Word on the History of the Evangelical Alliance; by D. Tissot.
10. September 1861, or the Evangelical Alliance at Geneva; by M. Merle d'Aubigné.
11. To the Members of the National Church of Geneva.
12. Answer to the Letter to the Members of the National Church of Geneva; by a Member of that Church.

13. Liberty and Exclusion; by Hugues Oltramare.
14. The Alliance called Evangelical; by Professor Chenevière.
15. A New Ally; an Episode to the Evangelical Conferences.
16. The Basis of the Evangelical Alliance examined; by a Disciple of Jesus Christ.
17. The National Church and the Evangelical Alliance; by L. Rochrich, Pastor.
18. What are we to Think of Confessions of Faith? by Em. R.
19. Your Differences and our Difficulties, on occasion of the Evangelical Alliance at Geneva; by D. Munier, Professor.
20. Programme and Regulations of the Sittings of the Evangelical Alliance.

If our readers had not heard of all the talk occasioned in the Protestant world by the general meeting of the Evangelical Alliance just held in the city of Calvin, the long list of diversified publications above recited would suffice to inform them how lively the discussion has been at Geneva, and how important a page in the modern history of Protestantism is supplied by the facts which have marked the meeting in question as held in that city. Of these facts we would endeavour to define the nature and indicate the import. We would have our readers read this page of contemporary history, not merely because it is our business to keep them well informed of all that concerns their church and their faith; not merely because there is real instruction to be drawn from these facts; but also because it is our own deep conviction that the final result is good, in spite of many things to regret, and that it is calculated to inspire hope in all friends of the free gospel.

It will be perceived that we do not propose giving an analysis of all the publications which have issued from the Genevan press on occasion of the meeting of the Alliance. Some of them are addressed to the popular mind in our churches, and are occasionally distinguished by a vividness of colouring and expression that is perhaps to be regretted, but is very easy to be understood, when we consider that they were written in the height of a very prolonged controversy which seemed on both sides to become warmer every day. Others of more scientific tone discuss the question of formularies or confessions of faith from the highest and calmest point of view. One or two, aiming at popularity above everything else, affect a tone of levity, and use strange comparisons (No. 8 for instance), leaving upon us an unfavourable impression; but almost all, whether favourable to the Evangelical Alliance or opposed to it, are conceived in a spirit and written in a style worthy of the religious question which was at stake, and altogether they form a very curious and instructive collection. We shall presently say a word about the most important of them.

As we are not about to analyze these publications in detail, no more shall we offer our readers a formal report of the meetings of the Alliance. We attended none of them. We do not at all doubt that distinguished orators spoke and that interesting things were said; the names of the speakers suffice to prove it.

Messrs. Rosseuw-Saint-Hilaire, Merle d'Aubigné, Ernest Naville and many more, sustained the height of the task imposed upon them and of their own reputation. We regretted (and many others with us) our inability to hear them. It will be seen where the fault lay. We could, indeed, by collecting the *on dits* that were current among the Genevan public, give an idea of the *physiognomy* of the meetings; but it would run the risk of incorrectness, and we choose rather to refer our readers to the official report which will be published. Besides, whatever degree of interest might be felt in the reports read and the speeches delivered, there is beyond doubt a still greater interest in the very fact of the Evangelical Alliance having met in Geneva, and in the circumstances which accompanied it; and as we have for a long time kept pace with the discussion which had arisen, and were on the spot at the time of the meetings, we can speak of this part of this subject with full knowledge of the why and wherefore.

Our readers are already somewhat familiar with the question; they may remember the various communications which in the course of the year our journal has received from Geneva. (*Lien*, March 16, 30, April 27, July 27, Aug. 31.) They are aware that the first appeal, issued by the Genevan Committee of the Evangelical Alliance on the 14th February, 1860, invited to the proposed meetings "all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ with a pure heart." There was something large and evangelical in this invitation. The Alliance, it is true, did not renounce the confession of faith which it has adopted; it did not declare itself willing to admit as *members* all who love the Lord Jesus Christ with a pure heart; it remained what it is, an orthodox Alliance; but without opening its doors to all Christians, it invited them all to join at least in the meeting. It distinguished two classes: the one, of orthodox *members* adhering to its confession of faith and bound to satisfy a dogmatic condition before admission; the other, that of simple guests, taking part in its meetings, qualified to ask and gain a hearing like the rest, and, for that purpose, only required to fulfil a religious condition—to love the Lord Jesus with a pure heart. This plan, and the distinction involved, will appear in the eyes of many of our readers not quite compatible with the Christian spirit: this division of disciples into two classes—the one class being considered Christian enough to be invited, but without being admitted as members; the other class as more Christian, and consequently worthy to be admitted distinctively into the Alliance—is certainly an anti-evangelical distinction. However, it formed a real advance upon the past of the association, and accordingly the immense majority of Christians in Geneva received the Committee's circular gladly. The Consistory of that city, calling to mind, with moderation equal to its firmness, that the Church of Geneva had in 1725 abolished

all confessions of faith, nevertheless granted the use of St. Peter's church; and though a certain number of the pastors and laity of Geneva felt the attempted distinction offensive *(blessante)*, we believe they would have suppressed their righteous sensitiveness in favour of peace and in consideration of the visible widening of the Alliance.

Unhappily, the Committee's second circular, dated Feb. 18, 1861, gave a mortal blow to these hopes, by substituting for the large programme of the preceding year a dogmatic formula. It said: "We invite not only the members of the Evangelical Alliance, but Christians of every people, of every language and of every country, ones *(sic)** with us in the belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, *the living and true God.*" Here, then, the two classes were still maintained: on the one hand, the *members* who accept intire the Alliance confession of orthodox faith; on the other, the *invited guests.* But, in order legitimately to consider oneself as invited, it was no longer enough to be able to declare in soul and conscience that one "loves Jesus with pure heart;" it was necessary to accept one of the Alliance dogmas, the Trinity, inasmuch as the Committee invite those who have "belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, as the living and true God." Such is the meaning ascribed on all hands to this circular; our readers will agree that it seemed natural enough so to understand it. Yet the attempt has been made to throw doubt upon this interpretation by several partizans of the Alliance,—by several of those who, in the bosom of the Genevan Church and Consistory, had laboured most zealously to prepare for the meeting. From many quarters explanation was demanded, but in vain. Even to the inquiries addressed to them by the Consistory, the Committee replied by sustaining their two circulars side by side, and denying that they were opposed to each other. The result was, that many persons concluded they must have misunderstood the first circular, that its relative width was only in appearance after all, and that in the eyes of the Alliance the first requisite for loving Jesus with a pure heart is, to worship him as the second Person of the Trinity. A pamphlet, published by one of the most important members of the Committee, M. Merle d'Aubigné, came in support of this conclusion. M. Merle, whose object was "to make the Alliance better known," says very plainly that no one can love Jesus Christ except through knowing him truly, and that the Alliance demands "true love for the true Jesus." So, then, the Trinity forms part of the Alliance confession of faith; the true Jesus is in its view the second Person of the Trinity; and

* We know not whether this is Genevan French, or orthodox arithmetic, or a mere error of the press, to which the Parisian journalist slyly directs attention. "Les Chretiens de tout peuple, de toute langue, et de tout pays, uns *(sic)* avec nous dans la foi au Père, au Fils, au Saint-Esprit, le Dieu vivant et vrai."

thus it seems to be demonstrated that, when the Alliance invites all those who love Jesus with a pure heart, the exact meaning of this declaration is, that it invites only Trinitarians. It is true that M. Merle, in thus expressing himself, was speaking in his own name and not that of the Committee; and so, to the last moment, it was hoped that a more explicit declaration, quite plain and frank and emanating officially from the Committee itself, would settle the question. This hope was disappointed. Though besieged by inquiries, the Committee maintained an absolute silence. A certain one of its members addressed to one of the most honoured pastors a letter stamped with all the breadth of the first circular; but he wrote it in his individual name, and stipulated that it should not be made public. No effort could extort one word of official explanation; and when the Programme and Regulations of the Sittings (No. 20) appeared, you might read at the top—Article 1. "Every evangelical Christian who, wishing to respond to the summons of the Alliance, proposes to take an active part in the September meetings, must provide himself, at the office, with a card of membership for the Conferences." In a note is seen the intimation that one may be member of the Conferences without first becoming member of the Alliance, whose confession of faith is set forth lower down; but there is nothing to indicate what conditions must be complied with in order to be considered an evangelical Christian, and so to be able to become a member of the Conferences. This being the case, all those who, while loving Jesus with a pure heart, are not Trinitarians, found themselves in a strange perplexity. It was left to them to decide for themselves whether the Alliance invited them or not. Some claimed the tickets which were supplied to all who presented themselves; others, not coveting the reserved places to which these tickets intitled the holders, had to mix with the crowd, as mere auditors, the church doors being understood to remain open. Many felt that conscience required them to hold aloof, and we were of the number.

We have heard many solutions of the pertinacious refusal of the Committee to give a frank explanation to those who on all hands kept asking for it. We prefer passing by the different reports, by no means flattering to the Alliance, which pervaded the Genevan public on that subject. But we have felt bound to mark, as the first salient fact of this state of things, the ambiguity of this silence, and perhaps we ought to characterize it more severely than as ambiguity. We can appreciate all opinions, all states of affairs, if they be but clear and plain. What we do not appreciate is, that the leaders of a great association which takes the title Evangelical should not have more thorough frankness, and that they should not have understood it to be their first duty towards the Church whose large hospitality they asked and received, to answer plainly all the questions that could be put to them;

and their first duty towards the leaders which that Church has adopted for herself, to tell them plainly whether they were invited or not to the meetings for which the use of the ancient cathedral of Geneva had been requested.

We shall presently see what were the consequences of this strange conduct as regards the Evangelical Alliance.

(Continuation, Oct. 5.)

We have related (Sept. 28) how the Genevan Committee of the Evangelical Alliance refused, to the last, to answer the demands for explanation which were addressed to it, and to indicate clearly the conditions required to be fulfilled in order to consider oneself invited to its sittings. Thence resulted the second fact upon which we purpose fixing the attention of our readers.

This fact, which will perhaps be disputed, but is no less incontestable with us and every impartial witness, is, that the great majority of the Genevese clergy and laity held aloof. The Alliance having refused to explain and to say clearly whether the invitation was for Trinitarians only, or for all who, without being Trinitarians, love the Lord Jesus with a pure heart, it remained for each to decide the question for himself, and the larger part of the members of the National Church, both people and pastors, resolved it in the negative. The attempt has, we know, been made to dispute this result, especially at Geneva before the meetings began. The address which we republished *(Le Lien*, Aug. 31) bears twenty-two signatures (No. 11); and in return the friends of the Alliance printed the list of the fifty-seven Genevan ecclesiastics who had not given their names. The *Archives du Christianisme* tried (Sept. 10) to pass off this list as containing none but names favourable to the Alliance, and (no doubt inadvertently) employed the word *undersigned (signataires)* to describe the fifty-seven ecclesiastics in question. That is a manifest inaccuracy. There neither was nor could be any demonstration in favour of the Alliance signed by these fifty-seven ecclesiastics, because a good part of them are opposed to it. For instance, Professor Munier, whose name does not appear at the bottom of the document republished by us, and consequently counts among the fifty-seven other names in the list afterwards published, has in a pamphlet given his own explanation of his motives for absenting himself. Were we not averse to citing names, we could point out many other similar cases. In fact, the opposition of the Genevan clergy assumed different forms and shades according to individual character, position and opinion. This was inevitable in any case, and particularly among a numerous and enlightened body of men brought up in the brave school of intire liberty of conscience, where the rigid and unevangelical discipline of party is unknown and every one is guided by the inspirations of his own conscience. Some thought it their duty

to make public their opposition and address themselves collectively to their flock; others, as M. Munier, individually explained the step they meant to take, and the reasons which compelled them to abstain from all part in the meetings; others again simply kept aloof, without making any secret about it, explaining themselves very freely in private conversation, but still without publishing their intention through the press. It would be easy for us, if it were not exceeding our duty and violating the reserve due to brethren, friends or venerated masters, to supplement these intimations by lists of names.

A circumstance of no less significance is this: The places habitually occupied in St. Peter's church by the lay members of the Consistory, had been reserved for their official use, but were not occupied by them; and their studied absence both was and was taken to be of the most marked kind.

In speaking of the laity in general, it is no doubt difficult for us to be equally precise. Yet to all who were then at Geneva it was evident that they held aloof; their opinion manifested itself very visibly; for it was not merely the indifferent—too numerous a class in the National Church at Geneva, as in every church in the world—it was the religious men also who held aloof; and without in the least degree failing of the rules and duties of hospitality towards the numerous strangers assembled in their city, they found the means of making known what they thought. The religious festival known by the name of the "Genevan Fast" took place during the meetings of the Alliance; when it was remarked that the churches where any of the twenty-two who had signed the protest preached, were filled with worshipers, while those in which one or two of the declared partizans of the Alliance were to be heard, included many empty places within their walls; the worshipers had chosen this method of silently intimating on which side their sympathies were, and in what ranks they expected to find their religious wants truly satisfied. An equally significant concourse presented itself when, on Sunday, Sept. 8th, the pulpit of St. Peter's was occupied by one of the pastors of the Reformed Church of Paris, M. Ath. Coquerel, Sen., whose tendencies and opinions are well known.

This attitude of the Church of Geneva is explained by that previously assumed by the Committee of the Alliance; but also by a circumstance which we have not yet mentioned.

At the last moment, when the Programme of the Sittings (No. 20) appeared, it was the occasion of extreme astonishment to find that, by the decision of the Committee, the Alliance confession of faith (of the French branch) was to be read each day, at the opening of the sitting, in the church of St. Peter, and heard by all the pastors standing on the platform. It was understood that no such thing had taken place at the previous meetings in London, Berlin or Paris. The effect produced was immense

and most deplorable. The Church of Geneva has, from 1725 downward, abolished all confessions of faith. Rightly or wrongly, men saw in this step, so unexpectedly taken by the Committee, a sort of challenge which was a strange answer to the hospitality received by the Alliance from the Genevan Church. From that moment, many persons who were still hesitating and earnestly desiring that it might be possible for them to join the meetings, who were anxiously looking for a somewhat wider declaration from the Committee in order to come and join it,—took their resolution, and, with a sorrowful closing-up of heart, resolved to keep aloof. In vain did the Committee, silently retracing what they had done, relinquish this shameful and unjustifiable measure,* and content themselves with having their confession read on three days in three different languages. The die was cast, and the Alliance had definitively forfeited the sympathies of that Church whose quickest sensibility it had wounded.

Nor was it with the secret joy of party spirit on seeing their adversaries spoil their own cause, that the Genevan flocks and their leaders resolved by a very large majority to hold aloof. No; the sentiment that we saw uppermost was that of genuine sadness. No; they would have wished with all their heart to offer to the numerous strangers who were at Geneva, something more than the material hospitality of their churches and their splendid city; they would have wished to remain in intimate union of heart and mind with them; and if they held aloof, it was that their conscience imposed on them the painful duty. They had hoped that the Alliance, founded at first on the narrowest basis, but which has since seemed tending towards something wider, would date its presence in Geneva by a new step in that direction. This hope has been cruelly disappointed. If the indefiniteness in which the Committee wrapped itself was no sign of frankness, no more was it of breadth. It merely denoted the false position of the Committee, placed between the members of the Alliance and the foreign visitors meeting in crowds, on the one hand, and on the other the mass of Genevan Protestants;—a false position, from which they had not the courage to emerge by declaring themselves plainly in one sense or another. Perhaps it also denoted some internal dissensions, some divergences of opinion, with which, it is plain, we have no concern; but evidently it did not mark the adoption of any resolution to open wider the door of the Evangelical Alliance, at present scarcely a-jar. The Church of Geneva therefore found herself compelled to renounce the hopes which for a moment she had conceived. She did it with a lively sense of

* We are told that the confession of faith was only read on three different days, once in French, once in English, the third time in German. But it is to be remarked that no official communication ever announced the retractation of the original decision.

sadness and regret. So true is this, that of all the numerous pamphlets which, on the one side or the other, have appeared up to the last moment,—of all the publications a list of which we give,—those which have produced the most vivid and profound impression and carried the feeling of the Church with them, are, beyond dispute, the Manifesto signed by twenty-two names (No. 11) and the pamphlet of Professor Munier (No. 19). The first of these papers, dignified and moderate, recommends the worshipers to remain apart;* the second expresses, together with the motives which constrained its author to stand aloof, that sentiment of regret and sadness of which we speak, and which so many worshipers as well as their pastors participated, while abstaining from the meetings.†

This conduct has been so manifest, that the result seems to us accomplished which the partizans of orthodoxy maintain to be so difficult. Perhaps, before these meetings, they had hoped to be able to say on their return, that the old incorrigible Geneva, returning to her former self and abjuring her modern errors, was re-conquered to sound doctrine, and worthy at last to resume her place, so long deserted, among the body of churches that hold to the doctrines of the day after the Reformation. That hope is evidently disappointed, and this is the first happy result that we think we can deduce from the events which have transpired under our notice, and of which we have given our readers a report. In short, there have been in Geneva a thousand foreign pastors, of many shades of orthodoxy, no doubt,

---

* It is curious to notice the slashing tone of certain orthodox sheets in denying facts the reality of which they would never think of disputing but in ignorance of Genevan usages. The letter in question is well known to have been disseminated as a supplement to the *Feuille d'Avis*. The *Archives* of Sept. 10th rallies us pleasantly on our having said that this is a journal of wide circulation at Geneva. Well; while at Paris the *Lien* was jeered on this subject, at Geneva we heard the twenty-two signers of the protest vehemently reproached by the partizans of the Alliance,—not for the step itself, as it was acknowledged that they had a right to tell their flocks what they meant to do,—but for the means they had adopted of diffusing their letter. It was said, had it been laid in the booksellers' shops, it would have fallen under the notice of those only whose minds were already engaged with the question; but being distributed by thousands of copies with the *Feuille d'Avis*, it brought numbers of people abreast of the question who were indifferent till then, and ran the risk (it was said) of raising a dangerous agitation. It may thus be seen what the pleasantries of the *Archives* are worth, and with what carelessness its information is sometimes gathered.

† This fact of the absence of a decided majority of the Church of Geneva is not at all disproved by all that the orthodox prints report as to the large concourse of auditors that pressed to the sittings, as well as to many of the accessory meetings. There were in Geneva strangers enough assembled from all parts, to compose large meetings when joined to the members of the Free Church and a small number of the worshipers of the National Church. No more do we doubt that a spirit of cordiality reigned through all the sittings. It would have suffered no interruption if the whole National Church of Geneva had joined the Alliance; all the more natural therefore was it, sooth to say, that the members of that Alliance should be harmonious among themselves.

but all more or less attached to the principle of confessions of faith. By dint of daily hearing and repeating that there are no real churches except such as rest on the basis of a human formulary, they have ended in believing it; but, arriving in the city of Calvin, they found themselves in the presence of a Church which, ever since 1725, has rejected all human formularies, and is no less lively and flourishing on that account; they have had the opportunity of seeing, on the announcement of the resolution to read a confession of faith each morning under the arches of St. Peter's, the worshipers and pastors of that church leave the meeting in a body; they have had the opportunity of satisfying themselves that, by this false step, they had touched a sensitive chord; they have had the opportunity of hearing one of the few Genevan pastors who shewed themselves favourable to the meetings and took part in them,—one of those who had done most to promote them,—begin his report by declaring that he was not a member of the Alliance, and never should become one till the day when, abjuring every doctrinal formulary, it should cease to demand from its members more than this one condition: "*To love Jesus Christ with a pure heart.*" They have thus seen the orthodox Genevese themselves, with perhaps scarcely one exception, repudiate all idea of re-establishing a confession of faith in their Church. It seems to us impossible that all this should have failed to produce a certain impression on some of the foreigners assembled in that city. However thick the bandage put upon the eyes of many by a fixed creed in theology, we hope that a ray of light will have reached some from these events.

In another aspect, also, we believe happy consequences may be expected from what has just occurred, The Evangelical Alliance has evidently passed a serious crisis, and its position is henceforth clear. At Berlin, in 1857, it had found no little difficulty in rallying the liberal and enlightened party of German Protestants around it. It had been obliged to make concessions. At Geneva, for want of conceding enough, it miscarried and failed of attracting the National Church. In future its position must be clearly taken. It cannot remain in the indefiniteness which really satisfies nobody. It must either return to its original narrowness and become again (what its recent tendency has promised to leave as a thing of the past) the exclusive union of the orthodox party, or else it must open its doors wider, and gradually become what in reality it never yet has been, *evangelical.* This is our earnest wish, as it is that of its friends and opponents alike at Geneva. There is indeed something grand in this idea of uniting in one band the Protestant Christians of all countries, and assembling them from time to time in one vast session. It matters little, in our view, that the promoters of this idea, those who in England were the first to put it forward, do not hold our doctrinal opinions. We are not of those who think

there is nothing good out of our own doctrinal tendencies. What we deplore is, that the narrowness of dogmatic orthodoxy should up to the present time have rendered this idea abortive. What we desire, and what perhaps we may be permitted to hope, is, that the signal check just experienced by the Alliance at Geneva will contribute to open the eyes of its members, and that in future it will go forward in the way of true Christian comprehensiveness.

STEPHEN COQUEREL.

(To be continued.)

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF WARRINGTON ACADEMY.

BY HENRY A. BRIGHT, B.A.

We have long wished to reprint from Vol. XI. of the Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, our valued correspondent's "Sketch." We now offer, with a few omissions, the first part; the sequel shall appear in our next No.—ED. C. R.

IN the year 1753, the failure or decay of the several Academies belonging to the English Presbyterian body at Findern and Kendal and elsewhere, caused no inconsiderable anxiety to the more thoughtful and earnest among the liberal Dissenters. Where were they to look for their future supply of ministers? Where could those ministers be educated in a theology unshackled by creed and doctrine? On none did these questions press with greater weight than on John Seddon, the young minister at Warrington. The idea of founding a new Academy took possession of him, and the idea once formed was never dropped until it had been carried out in action. Well might the Rev. Philip Holland in after years bear witness to "the concern which he had ever expressed for its support, honour, success; the indefatigable pains which he took for this purpose; the indifference which he shewed to fame or censure, to good or evil report, so that he might serve the general designs of the institution." Lying before me is a large mass of Mr. Seddon's correspondence relative to the foundation of the Academy. How he worked, and wrote, and explained, and begged! He is never discouraged, though his discouragements are innumerable. He is never down-hearted, though his friends are always suggesting difficulties and prophesying evil. Mr. Daniel Bayley, of Manchester, thinks the design too large, and "should not London lay the foundation, and we be only supplemental," and "is not so populous, so pleasurable, so divided and so dear a place as Manchester very unfit for a seat of the Muses?" Mr. Peter Touchet, of Manchester, thinks that Warrington should not be mentioned as the site of the Academy. Mr. John Mort, of Chowbent,—to whom Mrs. Barbauld addressed

some lines, beginning, "Happy old man!" and whom she characterizes as "O rude of speech, yet rich in genuine worth,"—this Mr. Mort is afraid "our richer neighbours will not be over zealous in the affair." Mr. John Wilson, of Rivington, will subscribe the munificent sum of five guineas if necessary, but thinks it would be hardly proper to subscribe before Lord Willoughby. Lord Willoughby, of Parham, who afterwards became first President of the Academy, was, I suppose, the most important personage among the English Presbyterians of this date, and it is amusing enough to notice how respectfully (with one exception) all Mr. Seddon's correspondents name him. "Pray my duty to Lord Willoughby, if you think proper," writes the Rev. R. Godwin, of Gateacre. The eminent Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, rejoices that "Lord Willoughby and so many of Harry Hoghton's family have came into the subscription."

But before Lord Willoughby had entered into the scheme—which important date appears to be October 11th, 1754—a long circular had been sent round in July of the same year, signed by Daniel Bayley, John Lees, afterwards Sir Caryll Worsley, and seven others. This circular gives as the subscriptions already promised—

Manchester	£94	10	0
Liverpool	46	4	0
Birmingham	44	12	6
Warrington	31	15	6
	£217	2	0

In the April of the next year the subscription mounts up. Lord Willoughby will give his ten guineas, Sir H. Hoghton's family "will encourage us," says Mr. Seddon, "so that our present subscription amounts to about £300 per annum." Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, promises subscriptions from his congregation, and Bristol and Exeter will probably aid the cause. Leeds, however, looks coldly upon the plan, and thinks "the Glasgow education" sufficient for their wants. Liverpool, too, as may be guessed from the smallness of her contribution, is somewhat lukewarm. The fact was, that Liverpool regarded the whole affair as a Manchester scheme, and with that pleasing spirit of jealous rivalry which has always existed between the two towns, the Liverpool men insisted on the site of the Academy being Ormskirk instead of Warrington. And so a paper was drawn up at Liverpool, with seven excellent reasons for preferring Ormskirk. These reasons, however, do not bring conviction to the supporters of Warrington; and the Rev. R. Godwin, in a letter to Mr. Seddon, observes that "some of them are *false*, others *dubious*, and all, whether true or not, *trifling* and *impertinent*."* And then comes a re-

* In another letter, however, this same Mr. Godwin admits that "several are daily complaining that the people of Manchester are for managing everything

joinder from "the gentlemen in Manchester," and then a printed letter from Sam. Angier, Benj. Heywood, Joseph Brooks, Wm. Lightbody, and other of "the gentlemen in Liverpool," and then "Remarks on a Letter from the Gentlemen in Manchester to the Gentlemen in Liverpool, Subscribers to the intended Academy. April 27th, 1757." This last letter shews, I regret to say, that "the gentlemen in Liverpool," finding that they are not powerful enough to carry their favourite, Ormskirk, lose their temper most completely. Every fourth word in this last letter is italicised; and after much cutting sarcasm they indignantly demand of their opponents, "Are not such gentlemen more properly the authors of contention and division?"

The 30th of June, 1757, was now approaching, when the first general meeting of the supporters of the Academy was to be held. A stormy meeting was evidently expected, and it was more than probable that the whole scheme might founder just as it was getting fairly under weigh. Some anonymous friend of the Academy thinks it well before the meeting to distribute some printed "Rules proposed to be observed for the Better Regulation of Proceedings in the Affairs of the Academy now depending." There are nine of these Rules, referring chiefly to proxies, and the necessity of a good understanding between the Trustees, and Rule VI. runs thus: "To remove all ground of emulation between Liverpool and Manchester (where it is mostly feared) in the choice of persons to carry on the Academy, let Manchester have the nomination of one and Liverpool another, &c.;" that "&c." expresses a good deal, and probably means (for these Rules evidently emanate from Liverpool) that Liverpool may fix on the site of the Academy, and that Manchester perhaps may then be allowed to provide an architect.

There are two thin old vellum-covered volumes, which contain the minutes of the Warrington Academy. The second volume is only about one-half filled, for the hopes of the Trustees were but partially realized, and the Academy was closed in 1786, after a useful but precarious existence of nine-and-twenty years. It was on the 30th June, 1757 (as we find from these minutes), that the first meeting of Trustees was held, and Warrington was after all the place of meeting. Twenty-five Trustees were present. Two were from Birmingham and eight from Manchester. The ministers of Gateacre and Bolton, Mr. Mort, of Chowbent, and from Liverpool, Arthur and Benjamin Heywood, Dr. Angier, Richard Savage, Thomas Wharton, Thomas Bentley and James Percival, were also present. Warrington itself was represented by the indefatigable Mr. Seddon, Mr. Elias Bent (who now lies buried in the Cairo-Street chapel grave-yard) and three other

---

relative to the Academy, independent of others; that Liverpool is ignorant of all their measures, and has not once been consulted upon any one occasion."

laymen. After reading the "proposals for carrying into execution a plan for the liberal education of youth," a long list of resolutions was proposed and carried. Mr. Seddon, in whose handwriting the early minutes seem to be, appears, as well he might be, astonished at the unanimity which after all the meeting shewed, and writes, "resolutions in *all* which the whole assembly was perfectly unanimous." Perhaps the gentlemen of the rival towns were tired of quarrelling; perhaps they adopted the suggestion of dividing between them the patronage and appointments; perhaps, and most probably, the more important resolutions were modified at the time so as to meet the wishes of all. Be this as it may, Lord Willoughby is appointed President; Mr. John Lees, of Manchester, Vice-president; Mr. Arthur Heywood, of Liverpool, Treasurer; and Mr. Seddon, Secretary. Local Treasurers in the large towns are then appointed. The subscription-list is ascertained to amount to £469. 5*s*., and the benefactions to £148. 11*s*. Four Tutors are recognized as necessary to render the design complete, but at present it is more prudent to appoint three only. Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, is to be Tutor in Divinity; Mr. Holt, of Kirkdale, to be Tutor in Natural Philosophy; and Mr. Dyer, of London, to be Tutor in Languages and Polite Literature, and for the present in Moral Philosophy. Each of these Tutors is to have £100 per annum from the fund, and "with respect to dwelling-houses are to be at their own expenses." Poor students are exempted from payment of fees, but richer ones must pay £2. 2*s*. yearly to each of the Tutors. And then comes the resolution over which Manchester and Liverpool had already quarrelled in anticipation, and which was evidently drawn up with the most diplomatic care: "That for *the present, and as a temporary settlement*, Warrington is the most convenient situation for the Academy, and that Messrs. Hart, Bent, Leigh, Turner and Seddon, are hereby empowered to contract for houses immediately." A managing Committee is then appointed, certain regulations respecting their functions are passed, and it is declared that a general meeting of Trustees must be held every year. And thus the new Academy was started.

On the 20th October in this same year, a letter is sent by the Committee to the various subscribers. Houses suitable for the Academy have been engaged "for seven years only." Dr. Taylor and Mr. Holt are already settled at Warrington, and (as for some unexplained reason Mr. Dyer is not settled) they have promised to divide between them the Languages and Polite Literature and Moral Philosophy. The Tutors* will take boarders into their houses at £15 per annum for those who had two months'

* "They knew better than to usurp the title of *Professors*, as so many do in these days from ignorance or presumption; only a chartered body can give Professorships."—*Letter from Miss Aikin.*

vacation, and £18 per annum for those who had no vacation; these terms, however, are exclusive of "tea, washing, fire and candles." Three students have already arrived.

The choice of a third Tutor was matter of difficulty. Dr. Taylor recommended Mr. Scott, of Norwich; Dr. Benson, of London, suggested the Rev. Mr. Priestley, of Needham Market; others think Mr. Aikin, of Kibworth, would be the best man, and the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, of Montgomeryshire, has his supporters. At last the choice falls on Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Aikin, and a long, long letter from Mr. Seddon, dated March 11, 1758, and preserved in the minutes of the Academy, informs him of the fact. I will not trouble you by the enumeration of Mr. Aikin's virtues, and the names of the Trustees who recommended him, which take up a great part of this letter. One passage, however, is curious enough, as shewing what travelling in England was just one hundred years ago:

"Mr. Holland has given us some reason to hope that you will come over to Warrington in the Easter week, in order to take a view of your future situation; if so, give me leave to recommend the following plan. I'll suppose you set out from Kibworth on Sunday afternoon; as you intend travelling in post-chaises, you'l easily reach Loughborough or perhaps Derby that night; the next night you may come to Offerton, which is about a mile short of Stockport, where I am with Mrs. Seddon, and will be ready to receive you, and wait upon you to Warrington: you will do well to come prepared for riding, for you will not meet with any carriages at Stockport, nor are the roads to Warrington proper for them; when you get to a place call'd Bullocks Smithy, about two miles short of Stockport, enquire for Offerton. Mr. Roe, late of Birmingham, now lives there, and we shall be glad to see you. If you'l write to me time enough, and be particular enough in your time, I will endeavour to meet you with my own chaise, or send a servant for that purpose."

Dr. Aikin accepted the invitation, and another letter is inflicted upon him by Mr. Seddon relative to a house which he recommends him to take, which is "handsomely sashed to the front, with a flight of five steps to the entrance."

Of the three Tutors now in residence, two were amongst the most eminent of the Dissenting divines in England. Not many years ago it would be quite unnecessary to speak of the many and varied accomplishments of Taylor and of Aikin. It will draw me far from my subject if I say all I could wish to say of these great, good men. But time has laid his hand upon their images, and something must be done—some few words must be said—to clear away the moss and rust and decay which hang around and corrode them.

Dr. Taylor, of Norwich (whose descendants number among them the present Gresham Professor of Music and many other accomplished and eminent men) was one of the first Arians who ministered to the English Presbyterians. His learning was so

generally acknowledged, that in 1754 all the English and Welsh Bishops and Archbishops, with but four exceptions, were among the subscribers to his great Hebrew Concordance. His publications were so widely read, that even Robert Burns had read his Treatise on Original Sin, and in his Epistle to John Goudie says,

> "'Tis you and Taylor are the chief
> Wha are to blame for this mischief."

Bishop Bathurst, of Norwich, used to say that if he understood St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he owed it to Mr. Taylor's volume on the subject. One of his principal works was translated into German, and several of them found their way into the library of Schleiermacher and other great theologians of Germany. Such was the scholar and divine who became the first Tutor in the Academy. He was a great loss to the congregation which he left at Norwich; and in leaving them for what was indeed a sphere of greater responsibility and higher usefulness, he was nevertheless sacrificing a dear home, pecuniary advantages, and the blessings of a free and independent position. And his sacrifice was greater than at the time he knew. Scarcely two years pass, and Dr. Taylor has learnt a sad lesson, which would have been spared to him had he remained the loved and faithful pastor of a loving and affectionate people. But at first no one could have been better suited to his post than Dr. Taylor. The charge to his pupils, with which his lectures in Divinity were prefaced, has been often quoted in illustration of English Presbyterian principles, and is so truly noble that you will perhaps forgive my quoting it once again:

"I do solemnly charge you, in the name of the God of Truth, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the way, the truth and the life, and before whose judgment-seat you must in no long time appear, that in all your studies and inquiries of a religious nature, present or future, you do constantly, carefully, impartially and conscientiously attend to evidence as it lies in the Holy Scriptures, or in the nature of things and the dictates of reason, cautiously guarding the follies of imagination and the fallacy of ill-grounded conjecture. Second, that you admit, embrace or assent to no principle or sentiment by me taught or advanced, but only so far as it shall appear to you to be supported and justified by proper evidence from revelation or the reason of things. Third, that if, at any time hereafter, any principle or sentiment by me taught or advanced, or by you admitted and embraced, shall upon impartial and faithful examination appear to you to be dubious and false, you either suspect or totally reject such principle or sentiment. Fourth, that you keep your mind always open to evidence; that you labour to banish from your breast all prejudice, prepossession and party zeal; that you study to live in peace and love with all your fellow-christians; and that you steadily assert for yourself, and freely allow to others, the unalienable rights of judgment and conscience."

The Rev. Dr. Aikin (who was father of the celebrated physician and of Mrs. Barbauld) had been a pupil of Dr. Doddridge.

He was, says Gilbert Wakefield, "a gentleman whose endowments as a man and as a scholar it is not easy to exaggerate by panegyric. . . . . His intellectual attainments were of a very superior quality indeed. His acquaintance with all true evidences of revelation, with morals, politics and metaphysics, was most accurate and extensive. Every path of polite literature had been traversed by him and traversed with success. He understood the Hebrew and French languages to perfection, and had an intimacy with the best authors of Greece and Rome superior to what I have ever known in any Dissenting minister from my own experience." Mr. Wakefield's testimony is borne out by all, and they were many, of Dr. Aikin's friends. He was, if any can be,

Integer vitæ scelerisque purus,

a man of strictest honour and most blameless life.

Of Mr. Holt, the Mathematical Tutor, I need say nothing. Miss Aikin calls him "a man whose whole soul was absorbed by his science;" and the writer in the Monthly Repository, who devotes some two pages to his character, seems utterly bewildered at finding any one so dull and dry and colourless.

Mr. Seddon, to whose exertions the Academy was owing, was a practical and useful man, full of energy and intelligence. He had many friends; and Dr. Percival, in an epitaph which is *not* on Mr. Seddon's grave, speaks of "his cheerful piety, universal benevolence, extensive knowledge, and temperate zeal for civil and religious liberty." I am afraid though, that, like Mr. Holt, Mr. Seddon must have been a dullish person. His letters are heavy and wearisome, and his only idea is to extol the Academy. Miss Aikin, in a letter which I received from her in 1856, tells me, "Mr. Seddon did not scruple some stout puffing on behalf of the Academy. My aunt (Mrs. Barbauld), on receiving at Palgrave one of his annual official statements, wrote to my father, 'Who hath believed our report?' My father, after being taken when a boy to hear Mr. Seddon, excused himself for not bringing his father the notes of the sermon which he was always required to make, because, he said, with all the attention he could pay he could not make out what it was about. 'Nor I neither,' was the answer."

Not long since I had the pleasure of spending a day at Warrington, in order to see for myself the old Academy and the more pretentious buildings to which, in 1762, the Academy was transferred. The old Academy is that which Mrs. Barbauld immortalized in lines which every one knows from "Enfield's Speaker." She bids us

> "Mark where its simple front yon mansion rears,
> The nursery of men for future years;"

and tells us that the "Mersey"

> "Reflects the ascending seats with conscious pride."

The Rev. W. Turner, too, speaks of "a range of buildings" with "a considerable extent of garden ground, and a handsome terrace walk on the banks of the Mersey, possessing altogether a respectable collegiate appearance." Perhaps it might have been wiser to take the old Academy on trust, and let fancy picture the building worthy of Mrs. Barbauld's poem and the energy of Mr. Seddon and the Warrington Committee. At least I should have supposed that the Academy faced the river, and that there was something to distinguish it from surrounding houses. This blissful ignorance, however, has been dissipated, and I know now that the very "simple front" of the ugly, mean, old brick house never fronted the river, and that a narrow, dingy side, with six windows ranged in pairs along it, and a single attic window, surmounted by a weathercock, was all that the river, with all its "conscious pride," could manage by any possibility to reflect.

Such were the Tutors, and such the buildings, of the Warrington Academy during the first years of its short life.

THE "HOME PAGE" TRACT FUND.

Sir,

I must thank you cordially for the kind interest you have at various times expressed in this series of tracts, and especially for recently bringing my appeal on the subject so prominently before your readers.

At the same time, may I be allowed to correct an erroneous impression which I find has been given by your allusion to an offer on the part of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association to undertake the pecuniary responsibility for the series? Some of my friends are hesitating, I find, to subscribe to a special fund, since there is such an alternative to fall back upon. The simple fact is, that the offer of the Committee was coupled with a condition as to the appointment of a joint editor, which I thought would not work well. I had endeavoured to bring out a new kind of *doctrinal* tracts, very simple and illustrated by incident and anecdote. I was willing to have given up my series to the Committee and simply to have edited *for them*, but I could only do this on condition of the sole editorial control being left with me.

I think the Committee were perfectly justified in proposing their condition, but I preferred and still prefer to carry out my original idea in its integrity.

I shall therefore be glad if any friends who wish to aid me in doing this, will communicate with Mr. R. D. Darbishire, 21, Brown Street, Manchester, or with me, as soon as possible.

Sheffield, Oct. 22, 1861. Brooke Herford.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Seven Lectures for the People. By John Page Hopps. Fourth Edition. 8vo. Pp. 32.

Thoughts for the Heart and Life. By John Page Hopps. Post 8vo. Pp. 152.

Mr. Hopps is now well known to all interested in Unitarian action as a minister who, coming to us from another section of the religious world, has achieved great success as the advocate of liberal Christianity amongst the thoughtful artizans of Sheffield, and not only interested them in the services of religion, but created a strong personal attachment to himself. The two publications, of which we give the titles above, will shew what are the tools with which Mr. Hopps works and how he uses them. They indicate his possession of strong mental and heart faith—his habitual recognition of that common Christianity which, spite of all their differences, belongs to all believers—his power of putting long-accepted truths in new and interesting forms—and also that he loves to view every subject of thought and emotion with the eye of a poet. At the same time, though some things are put in popular phrase and must not be too exactly interpreted, Mr. Hopps does not forget that he has important truths to utter, and he speaks them out well and bravely.

The two books now before us have resemblances and some differences; the former is more rhetorical, the latter more quiet and devotional. In both there is poetry, but in the second the poetry is sometimes metrical in its form. If the "Lectures" are glowing addresses to the people, the "Thoughts" are quiet and earnest communings of a heart charged with piety and practical religion, or sober elucidations of some great doctrinal or religious truth.

The meditation on the "uplifted face of God" contains this beautiful illustration of the shadows and lights of life and the human soul:

"I have walked, at night-time, along many a road, that led by places where nature had put on her queenliest robe, and where she was most glad and fair, but they were all hidden in the gloom,—the narrow hedge-row or the uninviting road alone being visible, and the journey was as willingly concluded, as it was cheerlessly pursued. In the morning, I have re-trodden the same path; and now, as if some fairy had been there before me, all is changed. The night-dews have fled, and given place to a vigorous and healthy atmosphere. A thousand birds are busy in the branches of the trees, and in every hawthorn; and their sweet voices sound like the music of an awakened world. Deep down in a sweet green dell, that slopes from the road-side, I can both see and hear the silvery, tinkling brook, winding like a thread of light among the flowers and trees; and the green meadows, and the golden corn are there, and the sweet blue hills, with the dotting woods, and the dainty wreaths of smoke lazily curling over the trees, telling of sweet English homes that nestle there. And now I linger, in happy raptures, where last night I hurried by, with fretful haste. And all this, because this morning the dear sun has lifted up his face upon the world and me.

"Even so it is in our daily life, which often drags wearisomely and monotonously on, because we are in the dark, and need to see light in God's light. For he who walks in that light, needs no poor human candle, nor light of any lover's sun. The sweet meadows, that run not far from the poor prosy road of life, are uncurtained now, and he loves to wander there: and so the

God of Light becomes to him the God of Peace, for he maketh him 'to lie down in green pastures.' The singing stream of life that cometh from the garden of the Lord, with its message of gladsomeness to the garden of men, he now sees and hears with joy: and he is 'led beside the still waters.' 'Old things have passed away,' not only in him, but out of him, and 'all things have become new.' The social tie is consecrated, and home-life is not only dearer but holier than ever. Labour is blessed now, and the sweat of his brow, is worn as a garland of honour. Even nature is more beautiful to him now, since he has looked at them with eyes that have looked on the face of God. The trees seem all clothed with a brighter foliage, and the golden corn seems to wave with a richer wealth: and even the dear flowers seem to lift up their faces to him, borne up on a bonnier stem: and he can say—'Surely it is a world of joy and beauty—of loves and friendships—of blessed homes and holy altars—of sacred communions and lofty aspirations:' for he sees 'light in God's light.'"—Pp. 54—56.

We have found in both volumes, especially in the "Seven Lectures," some thoughts and many expressions to which we might demur. Some phrases on which we stumble we cannot square with our own theological definitions or with scripture; others are not consonant with pure taste. But the candid reader will concede much to Mr. Hopps's poetical temperament, and will set down some of the blemishes of these works as literary compositions to his earnest desire to make a strong impression on the popular mind. He is still a young man, and in due course, under the influence of a refining taste and increasing exactness of thought, he will see reason to lop off the redundancies of his rhetoric, and, without losing anything of his popular power, may become a scrupulously careful teacher of moral and religious truth.

We had made notes on several passages of the Lectures, particularly in those on the Bible and the Koran, designing to point out laxness in the use of language—the same word being used in the same discourse with different meanings—and statements as to matters of fact open to criticism. But we will rather put our criticisms into the fire, and offer in their stead a quotation from the beautiful little essay entitled "Little Things:"

"Perhaps there is a little child in your home, and to-day it sat watching you, and listening to you, and perhaps every now and then it astonished you by repeating, when you least expected it, some mannerism, or some phrase of yours. What the end of *that* may be no one can tell, for it is a great thing, often, to have a little child in the midst.—You teach it a little prayer, or some childish hymn, or tell it some simple story, or sing it some gentle song; and you go away and forget it on the morrow, but that little one has many thoughts, and you do not know what you have done, and what your prayer or story may grow to. Nay! the little penny toy you gave to it the other day, or the wonderful picture-book, has perhaps shaped it for life. Many a man too, has been made by a smile, and many have been lost through a sneer. We know who patted the head of her little boy, when he drew the likeness of the baby in the cradle, and showed it to his mother. We know who kissed him, and called it passing fair. 'And that,' said the warm soul of the artist, when, in the day of his fame, all England called him great,—'that made me a painter.' Ay! and who knows how many poets, painters and great-hearts, smiles and kind words, and gentle, caressing hands have given to the world! Yes, and who can tell how many of these, cold words, and scorn, and neglect have lost to the world for ever!"—Pp. 94, 95.

We do not wonder that thoughtful and sound-hearted men and women crowd by hundreds to hear Mr. Hopps's lectures.

The Edinburgh Review (No. CCXXXII.)

Contains, and in the full customary proportion, articles of interest and ability. In the opening article of the number, the reviewer takes a farewell as a critic of the historical labours of Lord Macaulay. The genial, loving and lamenting tone of the article, will be felt to be natural and appropriate in the journal which received and published the first and also the last exercises of Macaulay's rare critical powers. The comparison which the reviewer makes of Macaulay with Bolingbroke and Burke is both novel and just. We give a sentence or two:

"With whom shall we rank him? In intellectual power certainly with the greatest. Neither the versatile Bolingbroke, nor the wayward, graceful, inspired, and impracticable Burke, need have disdained the comparison. In pliancy and ease Bolingbroke surpasses him, as Burke does in delicacy of fancy, but in fertility of resource, fire, and power, he excels them both. We choose these two names as the greatest of the class to which Macaulay properly belongs,—the literary statesmen of England. It is needless to compare him with historians like Hume or Gibbon, or with political leaders like the great chiefs of the rival parties. He did not belong to either order. His writings were for the most part political, not philosophical; and, like those both of Bolingbroke and Burke, they derived their tendency and colour from his views of public and political life. He was a statesman writing of history. With Burke, indeed, he has a strong affinity: the same impetuous temperament, the same ear for sonorous composition, the same delightful power of abstracting and absorbing the mind, and the same genuine and unaffected warmth. But Burke, with all his refinement, has an element of coarseness about him, of which Macaulay was entirely destitute, and if the touch of the Irish statesman was freer, his drawing was not so true. Burke's judgment followed, Macaulay's led, the course of passionate and intense emotion, which frequently lured the first astray, but never beguiled the manly sense of the last.

"Bolingbroke, in capacity and power, is, perhaps, a more ambitious standard than Burke..... He had an amount of ability as a man of affairs, with a knowledge of, and power of adaptation to, men and things, to which the two others had no pretensions. But he has left, after all, only *nominis umbra*—the shadow, ill-defined and misty, of a mighty name..... He did nothing, and the fault lay not in his stars which he blamed so freely, but in himself,—in the coldness, selfishness, and insincerity of his nature.

"Alongside either, Macaulay holds his place, nor does he suffer by the contrast..... While he was a debater and an orator, a scholar, and a poet; while he could inspire the fancy either in its graver or lighter moods, impress the judgment and warm the heart; he had beyond them that steady-burning flame of patriotism, that ardent love of liberty, that strong, consistent, impressive sense of the rights of his fellow-countrymen, which from first to last, in the midst of great political excitement, living when great questions were canvassed by strong heads, kept him constant in his course."

The specialty of the article is the examination of the series of strictures on Macaulay as an historian, which with questionable taste Mr. Paget has republished in a collected form. The publication of those strictures during the life of the author assailed, gave evidence of critical courage which one could not but in one view admire. The renewal of these coarse assaults after the death of the great historian, few, we imagine, will approve. The reviewer charges Mr. Paget with imperfect acquaintance with the subjects on which he ventured to attack Macaulay. The charge is so well made out, that the critic may in his mortification console himself with the fact that the historian declined in his own person to administer the chastisement so richly provoked.—In the

second article, the subject is the Count Montalembert's glowing and imaginative picture of monastic life. The reviewer shews, illustrating his position from the pages of Montalembert, that the very best of the monks of the West, on whom he lavishes such eloquent panegyric, sinned against charity and kindly feeling, against tolerance and equity, against faith and godliness, and that they did so by the irresistible necessity of their monastic profession.—The article which follows, on the Agriculture of France, gives satisfactory indications of progress in that great country in this department of industry. We have in the large exportations taking place just now of our cereal products to France, and the consequent maintenance in this country of the high price of food, a proof of the practical importance, to us as well as our neighbours, of their being good and successful tillers of the ground.—An article follows on Irish family history, the O'Briens.—A moderate and prevailingly sensible article follows on Scottish Church History, founded on Mr. Cunningham's History and Dr. Lee's posthumous Lectures. The reviewer, with becoming nationality, resents Mr. Buckle's recent attacks on Scotchmen and their religion, which he characterizes as "ignorant and superficial." The reviewer is, however, no undiscriminating partizan; witness this concession:

"Scottish Presbyterianism has shewn itself capable of great heroism, but seldom of great thoughts..... Cromwell it never understood; whereas he fully understood it and a great deal more. He recognized its spiritual basis, but he repudiated its exclusive rights. He triumphed against it both by material and intellectual weapons—on the field of Dunbar, and in those wonderful letters which he wrote 'For the Governor of Edinburgh Castle,' in the autumn of 1650."

Here are the contrasted portraits of Archbishops Sharp and Leighton:

"The Scottish Episcopacy of the Restoration was one of the worst institutions that ever disgraced a government and oppressed a country. It was represented by a Primate of whom it has been said that, 'like all his predecessors, he was a traitor to the cause he had professed to serve,—that in a degree much worse than any of them he was false and selfish, unscrupulous in his ambition, cruel to those below, and abject to those above him.' There is a strange mixture of softness and polish, with a cunning and furtive cruelty, in the portraits of Sharp. We pity his bloody and miserable end on the bleak moor, a few miles from St. Andrews, a place still lonely in the quiet grey of a May afternoon such as that on which he perished; but aversion mingles with our pity when we think of the treachery, the craft, and the cruelty of the man.

"That Leighton should ever have been associated with Sharp—that his sainted name should adorn the annals of a system so false and feeble as the Restoration Episcopacy of Scotland—must ever remain a puzzle to the student. A nobler, purer spirit has seldom lived. A character so simple, sweet, and holy might have covered a multitude of sins in any system; but as it is, the very excellence of his character only serves to bring out the more flagrantly the incurable vices of the Restored Prelacy. Disgust at his companions, their motives and their measures, made him separate from them in their way down from London—he took no part in their triumphant return to Edinburgh—he stood aloof from their schemes of oppressive legislation; by himself he struggled for awhile to maintain his ground, and to persuade to the adoption of a milder and more equitable policy; but feeling his powerlessness, and the badness of the system more and more, he at length threw up his office, shook its soil from off his feet, and went into retirement. The flight of Leighton, in its way, is scarcely a less touching commentary on the nature of the system than the murder of Sharp."

The reviewer relates the circumstance which betokened, if it did not in part occasion, the downfal of the moderate party of divines, who during the last century and the beginning of this possessed a large and wholesome influence:

"In 1805 the well-known Sir John Leslie was nominated to the chair of mathematics in the University of Edinburgh. Leslie, although he had not yet attained to his later distinction, was already widely known by his discoveries regarding the nature and properties of heat. He had received from the Royal Society the Rumford medal: the highest scientific names recommended him for the position to which he aspired. But the chair of mathematics, like the other chairs in the university, had long been looked upon as a profitable appendage to the dignity and emoluments of a city minister. A Mr. Macknight, son of the commentator on the New Testament, was fixed upon by them as the person to fill the chair; a respectable man, but nothing more. The friends of Leslie and of science were resolved to carry the day, and they did carry it, but not without a desperate struggle. Untrue to the liberal instinct which had so long guided them, the Moderates charged Leslie with infidelity because, in a note to his 'Inquiry into the Nature of Heat,' he had spoken with approbation of Hume's Theory of Causation.' The popular Evangelical party, on the other hand, led for the time by the wise moderation of Sir Henry Moncrieff, espoused the cause of Leslie's appointment. The parties changed sides entirely, as Mr. Cunningham remarks. 'Hitherto the Moderates had been the earnest advocates of intellectual liberty. They had defended Simson, Wishart, Leechman; they had saved Kames and Hume from excommunication.' But they had outlived their old spirit, or at least they had changed their old tactics; and in either case the issue was fatal to them. They were beaten on their own chosen arena, the floor of the General Assembly; they were discredited in the intellectual world; they retired with 'broken ranks and damaged character,' and never recovered this disastrous defeat."

In speaking of the ecclesiastical revolution which gave birth to the Free Church, the reviewer styles it "a disaster which most good men now regret," and intimates that Dr. Chalmers only partially initiated and controlled its principles and modes of action. Its real authors were a younger race, hardier logicians, combatants subtler in tactics and more fiery and dogmatic in spirit. In parting from his subject, the reviewer, glancing from Edinburgh to Oxford, says a word on the present aspects of the Church of England:

"Whether Scottish Presbytery be capable at once of a vital spiritual and a free intellectual development,—of an activity which, while nobly fervent in every good work, far beyond the conception of the ancient Moderatism, shall unlearn the narrowness of party watchwords which represent the confusions of a past fanaticism far more than the strength of any Christian principle,—is a point which the future must settle. If the hope of this should be thought but slight, there are many signs around us to shew that the difficulty is one not merely inherent in Scottish Presbytery. The darkened scenes of recent religious controversy, and the panic of a startled theology, but too surely prove that the same difficulty, if in a less degree, attaches to the Church of England. It would be encouraging at least to cherish the confidence that the Churches have learned more than in earlier times to mingle tolerance with their contentions, and to strive for the Truth without 'misdoubting her strength' by the employment of carnal weapons in her defence. Surely Milton's high-hearted faith may expect some echo in this nineteenth century:—'Let her and Falsehood grapple. Who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? Her confuting is the best suppressing.'"

The article on the Life and Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, the most mystical and transcendental of the poets of the age, will probably

be resented on account of its good sense by the admirers of her song. The article on Dr. Hessey's Bampton Lectures on "Sunday" is candid and instructive, and illustrates the inconsistency of the Bampton lecturer in first abjuring sabbatical superstition and then endeavouring to rear in its place a *dominical* institution as of divine authority. The reviewer confirms the account given to Dr. Hessey of the practical working of the national sabbatarianism, in tending to make many people hate religion, in encouraging Pharisaism and hypocrisy, and in leading to much secret and other drinking to intoxication.

The number closes with an essay on that gloomy, hopeless subject, America and its disunited States. The reviewer regards the reconstruction of the Union and its return to working order as an impossibility. He discredits the attempts of the statesmen of the North in transferring to their Constitution high European doctrines of allegiance. The future of the States is, he thinks, a very dark prospect. The success of the North would throw upon it the whole burthen of the Slavery question, with which its politicians are manifestly unprepared to grapple. But he does not anticipate on either side decisive military success. He hazards the conjecture as to the issue of the contest, that the North and the South will be compelled by weariness and positive exhaustion to submit to a separation which will not be temporarily satisfactory, and cannot yield the basis of an enduring state of peace.

In a note on an article on Popular Education which appeared in the previous number, the reviewer welcomes the appearance of the new Minute of the Committee of Council on Education, as likely to prove a salutary remedy of many of the evils to which the Government system of education, and especially its excessive protection of its teachers and pupil teachers, had given rise. He notices the immediate fulfilment of his prophecy of "a vehement outcry" from the protected and favoured classes at the prospect of the diminution and withdrawment of the system of bounties. The reviewer, after remarking that the late system is irrevocably condemned by the very persons who have administered it, proceeds to state his views of the new Minute:

"The remedy applied by the new Minute to the most prominent defects of the old system is direct and simple. The grants to schools are to be regulated by the results obtained; and the contribution of the State, paid to the managers in the form of a capitation grant, is to be applied by the managers to the several purposes of the school, including the wages of pupil-teachers and the augmentation of the master's salary. It by no means follows that the aid given to a well-conducted school will be diminished; but it will be paid in a different form, it will give greater liberty of action to school managers, it will increase with the regular attendance of the children, and it will be conditional on good teaching; so that the assistance of the State, instead of degenerating into a screen for inefficiency, as it is too apt to become in all branches of the public service, will be a powerful stimulant to excellence and activity. We are satisfied that the principle on which the new Minute is founded is a sound principle, and is a great improvement on the former system."

The reviewer concedes, however, that the details which the Minute prescribes as determining the proficiency of the scholars and the consequent amount of the capitation are open to criticism, and may be advantageously modified. We hope this subject will be discussed temperately and impartially, with a view not to the interests of a privileged class, but to the good of the commonwealth.

INTELLIGENCE.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, CARMARTHEN.

The session was opened, Oct. 1, by the following introductory address by the Principal, Dr. Lloyd:

Gentlemen,—I beg to congratulate those of you who have been here before, on your appearance among us once more in full possession of your usual health. During the last session, some of you suffered severely from ill health, but your lives have been mercifully preserved. We hope this will not only deepen your gratitude to the Great Preserver of all, but will also render you more careful of your health this session. It is of the highest importance that you should lodge in clean, well-aired and healthy localities, and, above all, that you should observe great regularity in all your habits; this will render your duties comparatively easy, and will tend beyond calculation to the preservation of your health. You can never have the "mens sana" except in the "corpore sano." The highest mental abilities must be weakened and rendered almost inert by ill health and physical weakness. Carefully avoid *late* hours, and learn to be temperate in all things. You may be teetotallers and yet be very intemperate. Remember that there is such a thing as a moral and spiritual intemperance as well as a physical one. The sacred injunction is, "Be temperate in all things,"—temperate in your *language*, *thoughts* and *feelings*. Cultivate as much as possible the finer affections of our nature. Be meek, humble, and not "easily provoked." Keep a constant restraint over your predominant feelings and passions, and then you will soon be able to subdue them. It is astonishing how much moral weed can be eradicated and destroyed by a little care and watching. It is when you are heedless of all moral culture that the enemy "cometh and soweth tares" in the good soil. The world, no doubt, has its temptations, its dangers and its snares, and young men of your age are peculiarly exposed to them. The moral atmosphere by which you will be daily surrounded is far from being pure, and may at any moment engender in your nature a moral disease that it will take many years of pain, sorrow and labour to remedy. It is only by the most unremitting vigilance that you can successfully resist the deadly influence of this moral epidemic. You must habituate yourselves as much as possible to the pure moral atmosphere which constantly encircles the sun of righteousness. Remember that you profess, *openly* and *publicly* profess, to live in the light of the "Sun of Righteousness." You should make it the great purpose of your lives to shun the deeds of darkness—"to put on the whole armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the enemy." This is the only true source of moral health and of moral life and of all moral strength. You may rely upon it that you must have *power* first to *govern yourselves* before you can ever influence others. Man, before he can worthily and successfully inculcate the virtues of our holy faith, must practise them himself. The importance of *being* ourselves what we seem to wish others to be, *cannot* be overrated. "Actions speak louder than words," is one of our best old proverbs. Our thoughts, sentiments and ideas are liable to misapprehension; their power is often modified and even occasionally lost by the obscurity of the medium through which they have to pass. But deeds are always perfectly intelligible. The most elaborate discourse on the principles of morality will prove tame and cold in comparison with the eloquence of a pure life. The spectacle of the penitent publican beating his breast and pouring forth the broken utterance of his deep contrition, is a nobler sermon on repentance than the most eloquent lips could ever utter. A life like that of the meek and lowly Saviour will penetrate where words and sermons can never reach. Again, in the midst of the occupations and studies which must necessarily employ the greater portion of your time in this Institution, you must not forget that all your learning and attainments ought to be subordinate to your moral and spiritual growth,—ought to be subordinate to the great *end* for which you are preparing yourselves—to be ministers of Christ's holy gospel. You profess to be the disciples of the *great Model* of humanity, and the world is perfectly justified in expecting to find in your characters some resemblance to the great Master. The advantages of good natural abilities, of refined taste, and of extensive and varied intellectual attainments, are highly valuable, and I may say, in the present enlightened age, essential qualifications in a candidate for the Christian ministry; but after all they are but of secondary importance. They are indispensable conditions, essential elements, in the mighty processes which are to make you useful and worthy followers of Christ;

but they are not the *end:* the end is to make you "imitators of God as dear children." And *this end* can never be attained by the closest attention to your studies, by the most unremitting exercise of your mental and intellectual powers. This end can only be attained by close and frequent communion in thought and in prayer with the invisible Source of all life, purity and power. How often did the Saviour retire to the mountain in order to elevate his spirit to the "Father of spirits"! You must be thoroughly and profoundly penetrated by this spirit of prayer, which is peculiarly the spirit of your Divine Master, before you can feel the dew of heaven cooling, refreshing and invigorating the divine germ within you, which can never germinate in the icy and cold atmosphere of earth. The spirit of true religion, so far from repressing your ardour for intellectual pursuits, will increase it, by offering to your energies an employment worthy of them. It will improve and elevate your taste; it will furnish you, as it were, with a new *sense*, which will afford you a new relish for all that is pure, good and beautiful in God's creation. Pure religion will expand all your faculties, will enrich all your feelings, will unfold all your nature, and enable you to comprehend in all the arts and sciences, in all knowledge (whether physical, moral or intellectual), those higher principles which bear upon all our relations to the spiritual world, and connects us together as children of the same Parent, heirs of the same immortality.

No man can be just to himself, can comprehend his mission and all its duties, can put forth all the powers of his nature, can deserve to be the guide of others, till he has risen to communion with the Supreme, —till he feels his filial connection with the universal Parent, and is ready and prepared to consecrate all his energies to the great end of his being,—to become coworker with God in all that is good, pure and perfect. All truth throughout the universe is ultimately connected together, although we cannot in this imperfect state trace it in all its most remote ramifications. There is nothing in God's universe worth knowing, worth investigating, worth possessing, by a rational nature, but *truth;* for it is the peculiar and only function of all truth to lead directly to the *True* and the Beautiful. And thus, in the elevated and poetical style of the New Testament, life eternal, the highest state of happiness and purity a mortal can attain to, is said to consist in knowledge of the only true God; and this knowledge we can nowhere find except in the life and teachings of Christ.

All objects of human thought flow into one another. Moral, physical and metaphysical truths have many indissoluble bonds and analogies, and nothing could be more absurd than to attempt to divorce them. "What God has united, let not man attempt to separate." Whatever subjects may engage your attention, labour to cultivate a profound love of *truth.* In all processes of investigation, have a simple eye to the truth. Forget all known theories, all mere speculations, and follow as closely as you can the laws of sound reasoning and the true method of inquiry. Remember that your intellect has not been given you, that you may receive passively the teachings of others. This has been too much the case, especially in all matters connected with mental philosophy and religion. Age after age the same path is trodden, the same field is traversed, till the subjects (of all others the most quickening and interesting) are become trite and worn out. Observe and study the world in which you live for yourselves; trace the connection of events; rise from particular facts to general principles, and apply those principles to new circumstances, new phenomena; then you will be really able to see things with your own eyes, to become interpreters yourselves of nature and of providence, and thus every object will become invested with new interest and with new beauty to you. And thus an increasing thirst for knowledge will imperceptibly grow in you, all your studies will become the source of the purest pleasure, and an impulse for the attainment of knowledge will be engendered which will continue, with constantly increasing force, when all the instructions of the school and the college are for ever closed.

Too often, I am afraid, do young men, on leaving college, feel as if all efforts for the attainment of knowledge were over, as if the work of intellectual culture were completed, and as if they had already stored up enough of mental food for the remainder of their lives. Remember that one of the most urgent wants of a comparatively enlightened age is an enlightened ministry. Ignorance only then becomes truly intolerable when it presumes to guide and teach others. Knowledge, and knowledge alone, is *power*, in the pulpit as well as everywhere else; but as the subjects generally treated there are of the most elevated and profound nature, the more light and knowledge are brought to bear upon them, the more deeply they will penetrate the human mind, and the more powerfully they will affect the human heart. Above all, remember that the Christian church in all ages wants "men

powerful in the Scriptures,"—men that can rightly divide the word of God, and not frothy declaimers nor elegant essayists. These are like those ephemeral insects which shine and glitter for a moment and then disappear, without leaving any permanent impression upon the age in which they live. To be of service to God and man in our day and generation, we must feel *ourselves* the great truths of revelation, as well as to be able to communicate them to others. They must issue forth fresh, vigorous, life-giving, from the minister's own heart, before they can ever reach the hearts of his hearers. The Saviour emphatically declares, "My words, they are spirit and they are life." But oh! how sad it is often to hear the words of life issuing forth from cold lips and frozen hearts, without ever becoming spirit, without ever becoming life! As science is essential to art, so the knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus" is essential to the life of Jesus. The pure life is the practical result of the pure doctrine. It is the peculiar excellence of the Christian religion that it ever inculcates theory and practice. Its language is, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." To be duly effective, "truth" must not only fall from the lips, but it must fall into the good soil, "the understanding," before it can bring forth fruit unto "everlasting life." The correctness of the life is the natural result of the correctness of the doctrine. If the first principles of action be erroneous, error must characterize more or less all their operations. If the source be bitter, all the streams which issue from it must partake of the same quality.

Remember, that as the organs of sight must be kept unimpaired before you can duly appreciate the beauties of the external world, so also the powers within must be carefully kept in an efficient state before you can discriminate justly and properly the realities of the external world.

I wish further to impress it upon your minds, that no mission is so holy, no work is so truly heavenly, as that of the minister of the gospel, provided he goes forth freely, spontaneously, voluntarily, to labour in his Lord's vineyard, and not as the paid hireling of the State. If you have no real taste for your Master's service—if any other feeling stimulates you than an earnest, pure, truthful love of your Master's work—if you are not thoroughly penetrated with the weight, grandeur and importance of the sacred office you undertake—unless you are prepared, through good report and evil report, reverently to hear and fearlessly to obey the voice of conscience and of God—honestly resign every intention of engaging in a work for which you have no qualification. No sacrilege is so awful as that of assuming the sacred office of the Christian minister either from motives of filthy lucre or of worldly honour; and no position can be so degrading to a rational being as that of the man who has bartered all that is noble, great and glorious in his nature and in his soul, for the paltry and evanescent honour of this world's glory. Finally, labour, then, faithfully, earnestly, perseveringly, in your Lord's vineyard. Work for God, for Christ. Be co-workers with God as dear children, because such a work is the only one that offers to your energies an employment worthy of them. Remember the Saviour's solemn injunction, "In this is my Father glorified, that you bring forth much fruit." The Father's glory is his children's happiness. You possess powers that are capable of unlimited progress. Let them have full course in God's universe. Freedom, perfect freedom, is essential to the growth and vigour of your highest faculties. God grant that they may be always centred in Him, the ultimate Source of all life, all power, all happiness!

CLOSING SERVICE AT CARTER-LANE CHAPEL.

It is not without a feeling of regret that we record the fact that the noted and ancient Presbyterian chapel in Carter Lane no longer exists as a place of worship, and that its site is presently to be occupied, as all the neighbouring buildings in that street have for some time been, by a lofty range of buildings devoted to commercial uses. Like the site of the first London meeting-house, which till lately stood in Monkwell Street, it will presently be unknown, except to some one curious in preserving notes of Nonconformist antiquities. Carter-Lane chapel differed from that in Monkwell Street in this respect, that it was not the original place of meeting of the early Nonconformists whose descendants have just taken their departure from it. The original place of the society was, according to Walter Wilson, at Rutland House, situate in Glasshouse Yard. Thence they removed soon after the Revolution to a court in Blackfriars, thence named Meeting-house Court. This chapel was destroyed by the High-Church mob of 1710, stimulated by that ignorant knave, Sacheverell, one of the most contemptible leaders ever acknowledged by a numerous party in a powerful Church. The chapel was after this disaster renovated at the cost of the Government. We will not now

stop to speak in any detail of the roll of honourable Nonconformist names connected with this Presbyterian society. The anticipated publication of Mr. Ierson's sermon will doubtless give us an early occasion of returning to the subject. It is enough now to mention the names of the more celebrated: Matthew Sylvester, the friend and biographer of Baxter; Richard Baxter, one of the greatest (if not absolutely the greatest) and most gifted of the glorious Two Thousand; and Dr. Edmund Calamy, the historian of the ejected ministers,—form a trio of Nonconformist worthies, to all of whom may be applied the words of the last in reference to one of his successors: they were "noble and honourable in heaven's blazonry." Among their successors were Dr. Samuel Wright, Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, Mr. Thomas Newman and Mr. Edward Pickard. There are living men who have ministered in Carter Lane of no mean celebrity, and whom all are ready to honour. And in thinking of the departed ministers of Carter Lane, our memory dwells on one of the excellent of the earth, the late Dr. Hutton. The place will not again, as of old, echo to the words of Christian wisdom and holiness, love and truth. The chapel was thus described by Walter Wilson in 1808: "The meeting-house in Little Carter Lane is a large, substantial brick building of a square form, and contains three galleries of very considerable dimensions. The inside is finished with remarkable neatness, and in point of workmanship is scarcely equalled by any place of worship among the Dissenters in London. The sombre appearance it exhibits, arising partly from the colour of the pews and galleries, immediately arrests the attention, and appears much better suited to the solemnity of divine worship than the theatrical style of decoration adopted in many of our modern chapels."

In form, style of finish and some other particulars, the chapel in Little Carter Lane bore considerable resemblance to the ancient seat of Nonconformist worship in Manchester, Cross-Street chapel. But it is long since Carter Lane had the advantage of a very large congregation, such as is to be seen in Manchester. As with the original society at Rutland House, so at Cross Street, Manchester, the services were conducted by a distinguished ejected clergyman, Henry Newcome, doing at the latter the work done in the former by Matthew Sylvester. The chapel at Cross Street, like that in New Meeting-house Yard, was demolished by a High-Church mob. Whether the Cross-Street congregation will follow the example set by Carter Lane, and abandon their town site for one in the suburbs, time must shew. We desire to avail ourselves of the opportunity of expressing our great interest in the future Islington society, the formation of which cannot but be a great advantage and gain to the metropolitan Unitarian cause. It is matter of congratulation that their spiritual instruction is confided to a gentleman so able and wisely zealous as Mr. Ierson.

We now ask our readers' attention to a short account of the closing service on Sunday morning, Oct. 13, kindly communicated to us by a friend who was present on the interesting occasion.

The congregation of the chapel in Little Carter Lane, St. Paul's, assembled in that place on Sunday, October 13, for the last time. The occasion was one which naturally brought together a numerous assembly of friends, some of whom had been in former years in regular attendance there, and who still retained an interest in the scene of many earlier pious associations. The service could not but be on many accounts an impressive one, while it offered to the Unitarians of the metropolis a seasonable opportunity for the expression of the very general and cordial sympathy which is felt amongst us with a church about to remove to another sphere of activity under circumstances of so much hopeful promise. It was perfectly understood that the closing service would not be one of lamentation over decay. The greater part of the present members of this church reside in the vicinity of the new building now in course of erection: their removal is a movement onwards. The successful hopes of the future seemed thus to moderate the natural regrets for the past, giving at the same time particular meaning and force to the exposition of principles which the recollections of the day suggested.

We trust that the celebrations of the 24th of August next year will be attended with a re-awakened interest in the history of our Presbyterian churches. Our younger members should be assisted to learn the various incidents which have fixed or modified the different forms of our existing organization, whether as Presbyterians, General Baptists or Unitarians, so simply denominated, or whatever other names we bear. They may at first be little disposed to appreciate the liberal spirit of so many amongst our orthodox predecessors in the churches to which some of us belong, and they may be disposed to shrink from the Calvinistic lineage which they are thus asked to claim; but they will admire the noble trust in the native

power of truth which an ancestry of even Trinitarian believers could display, and they will be led to observe gratefully how a church left free, as every church of Christ ought to be, becomes naturally and almost of necessity a church of Unitarian belief. Of this fact the history of the church in Carter Lane affords a striking illustration; it is one of our oldest congregations; but we do not doubt that of many others a story of equal interest and value might be told with that which Mr. Ierson recited in his last discourse in the old and venerable meeting-house.

As the sermon is understood to be preparing for publication, we offer no report of its contents beyond the general statement that it presented in the first place the incidental history of a Nonconformist church; secondly, the history of the church in its non-subscribing principles; and, lastly, traced the advances of liberal thought as the natural result of the freedom by which the English Presbyterian churches have been from their commencement distinguished. A free church devoted to practical godliness could have had no other history. The sermon concluded with a prayer that the same love of goodness, the same trust in truth which had been manifested in the older house of worship, might ever continue in the congregation in the home of their future labours.

Until the completion of the new chapel in Upper Street, Islington, the congregation hitherto of Carter Lane assemble for worship in the school-room which they have already built. Mr. Ierson opened the first morning service there on Oct. 20, and we understand that a large proportion of the sittings are already taken. For the present, the work of the Sunday-school is carried on in the old chapel; many of the teachers still hoping that an institution which has been for so long a time successfully maintained, will not be suffered to die out, but that it may yet be made the nucleus of a new mission to the poor in the neighbourhood of St. Paul's.

OUR MISSIONS IN LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.

The Report of the Missionary Branch of the Provincial Assembly, 1860-61, has just reached our hands. It is in itself an interesting document, and is the beginning of what we venture to hope will be a zealously-sustained and successful missionary effort. The subscriptions of the congregations are at present in some cases small; but as the work of the Mission expands and the case of the promoters of the scheme strengthens, we trust that our wealthy congregations in the two counties, instead of being content with sending annually £10, £12 or £23, will increase their contributions to £50 and £100. They can do it, and we hope they will. There are four divisions of the great district which the Provincial Assembly includes. The East Cheshire branch relies chiefly on the congregations at Gee Cross, Dukinfield, Knutsford and Macclesfield. The two special points of interest are the new congregation at Macclesfield and that at Flowery Field, for both of which it is hoped that, with the assistance of the Association, ministers may be speedily procured. This branch has incorporated with itself the Newcastle, Longton and Red-Street congregations, all in Staffordshire, but unless aggregated with the Cheshire Unitarians, they will be quite isolated. The agents by whose aid the work of this branch of the Mission is carried on are ministers, Home Mission Board students and a number of lay preachers. Some friends have, we learn from a private source, objected to this combined action of ministers with laymen and others less perfectly educated than themselves. We can understand such an objection from a believer in "apostolical succession" and "holy orders." To a Puseyite the objection may appear conclusive. To an intelligent Unitarian it should be powerless. Any man who understands the gospel is authorized to teach it. Any man not understanding all things involved in the Bible (and in this matter who will assert an unlimited qualification?), may teach what he does understand.

The collections made in East Cheshire for the Mission amount to less than £100. In the East Lancashire district more than £200 has been subscribed; and such is the activity that, notwithstanding a grant of £40 from the General Committee, the expenditure has exceeded the income. "The Committee have supplied the pulpits of the Mission stations at Accrington, Astley, Blackburn, Burnley and Heywood, during the year, and have assisted in opening a preaching-room at Wigan. They have also arranged a course of lectures on Thursday evenings at Leigh, which have been well attended. They have likewise supplied the pulpits of Rawtenstall and Clover Street, Rochdale, receiving subscriptions from these places towards the expense."

This is the report of one of the principal stations: "*Accrington.*—This congregation was founded in May, 1859, and has made considerable progress. The average attendance is 50 in the morning and 100 in the evening, being an increase over that

of the last year. There are 45 subscribers who contribute on an average £1. 10*s.* 8*d.* per month, and the collections of the year have raised, in addition to the subscriptions, £24. The Sunday-school contains 14 teachers and 96 scholars, of whom 30 are above 18 years of age."

The branch of Manchester district has had an income of more than £400, and has benefited by the zealous and very able agency of Mr. Street, and has during eight months been aided by Mr. Nutter. The stations of this branch are Blackley, Swinton, Middleton, Platt, Pendleton and Miles Platting. At Swinton the congregation well maintains its ground. At Blackley and Platt a revival of the old Presbyterian interest has taken place. At Middleton a congregation has been formed and a Sunday-school opened, and both are already self-supporting. At Pendleton and Miles Platting efforts, which wear a most promising look, are being made to build places of worship. "In addition to courses of lectures expository of Unitarian Christianity at the foregoing regular stations, others have been given under the auspices of the Association at New Bridges, Manchester; Failsworth, Oldham; and Monton. During the year 8000 Addresses, drawn up by Mr. Street, containing the principles of our faith and inviting the people to the various services, have been distributed from house to house at the stations, and about 8000 other tracts widely circulated."

The Liverpool branch has been formed at a later period than the others, and its results will, we do not doubt, hereafter be as successful as those of Manchester. To this branch will probably belong the organization of Missions at Southport and Windermere. The Committee have, we are pleased to see, resolved to open ground at the north end of Liverpool (Mr. Glover has been engaged as their missionary) at Crewe and St. Helen's. Our friends in Liverpool have carefully guarded their religious liberty by adding to the foundation document this clause: "The Association will aim at the diffusion of a Christianity always open to receive more and more of the inexhaustible light of God in the revelation of his Son, leaving to the agents it may employ entire liberty to speak their own convictions of gospel truth, and to the congregation it may assist or originate entire liberty to determine their own constitutions."

This is, we believe, the spirit in which all our Unitarian friends, with their several varieties of opinion on subordinate subjects, desire to work. It would little satisfy any of our friends to implant in men's minds a few dogmas, without sowing with them the immutable principles of liberty and charity. We are pleased to observe the statement that nearly all the congregations within the Liverpool district have testified a desire to connect themselves with the Association, and have promised collections in its aid. On the whole, this may be pronounced a very satisfactory Report, and the plans of action of this Missionary Society may well be imitated by our Unitarian friends in other districts of England.

MEMORIAL OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD TAGART.

The congregation of Little Portland-Street chapel have recently erected a very suitable memorial of their late lamented minister, Mr. Tagart, who had been the principal means of building the chapel, and officiated in it for nearly thirty years. The memorial consists of a bas-relief in marble, taken from a very beautiful full-length figure of Christ, pointing upwards, by Dannaker, which is in the Royal chapel at Ratisbon, and which so impressed and delighted Mr. Tagart that he frequently alluded to it during his journey and last illness as embodying the pure and elevating principles of that faith which he loved to teach, and reverence for that Divine Master in whose service he sacrificed his life. Under the figure are the words, *Per me ad Patrem*, which were among the last that fell from his lips. On the base is the following inscription, from the pen of the Rev. J. J. Tayler:

IN MEMORIAM
EDWARDI TAGART
HUJUS ECCLESIÆ
ANN. XXX
PASTORIS
NAT. VIII. ID. OCTOBR. MDCCCIV.
OB. IV. ID. OCTOBR. MDCCCLVIII.

The monument, which is wrought in the purest white marble, is placed immediately over the communion-table, and forms a very chaste and suitable ornament to that part of the chapel.

The difficulty of procuring a photograph that would convey the beauty of the original, and of executing a bas-relief, occasioned considerable delay in the erection of this memorial, but it cannot be denied that the sculptor has performed a difficult task with great success, and that a most appropriate tribute has been paid to the memory of a beloved and universally respected minister. In accordance with the majesty of the subject, the utmost simplicity, and the absence of all eulogium, was observed in the inscription.—*Inquirer.*

OBITUARY.

Aug. 5, in London, aged 24, Mr. HENRY SCHWANN, of Huddersfield.

August 7, at Hurdsfield, Macclesfield, aged 79 years, Mr. JOHN NEWTON, formerly of Wincle, who through his life was a consistent and zealous Unitarian Nonconformist, and a subscriber upwards of 50 years to the *Christian Reformer* and its predecessor. He was a working man, and for more than half a century was in the employ of one master. He was a pattern of sobriety and industry, a constant attendant on the public services of religion, and was greatly respected by his neighbours and fellow-worshipers. His zeal and firmness, however, in the profession and advocacy of his form of the Christian faith, sometimes excited the ire of intolerance, which denounced him a deist and an infidel. But the judgments of the bigot never disturbed the serenity of his mind. He had learned, not only the doctrine of the Divine Instructor, but had filled his soul with his spirit, and could patiently bear the little persecutions to which he was exposed. After a short illness, he left this world with a childlike trust in the love and mercy of the Heavenly Father, and without a misgiving that he was about to enter into a higher and happier condition of being.

M.

Sept. 21, at Edinburgh, in his 86th year, Major GRAHAME, nearly the last of the veterans of the Peninsular War.

He was for some time a resident in Newport, Isle of Wight, and had, previous to his last visit to Scotland, become a frequent worshiper in the Unitarian chapel at Newport. His tall, erect and commanding figure, and the numerous medals of honour he had deservedly gained and which he wore on his breast always on the Sabbath-day, rendered him conspicuous in the house of prayer; in the services of which he appeared to be deeply interested, and called several times on the writer of this brief memoir to express his satisfaction with what he heard. He observed that not until he entered the chapel at Newport from mere curiosity, was he aware of a body of Christians entertaining similar religious views to those he had cherished nearly all his life. He loved to speak of the paternal character and impartial love of God, and of the comfort which such views afforded him when in the midst of fearful dangers. Having seen so much of the world and its strifes, he was a most entertaining companion, and frequently delighted his friends by describing some of the stirring scenes of his long military career and marvellous escapes from death. The gallant old soldier who never feared death has at length been compelled to yield to the power of time.

T. F. T.

Sept. 22, at Norwich, after a lengthened illness, in her 66th year, SARAH SEDDON, wife of Mr. Samuel SOTHERN, and daughter of the late Mr. Wm. Alexander, of Great Yarmouth. Inheriting deeply the principles of Unitarian faith, she was constant to them throughout life herself and inculcated them in her family. Quick in the perception of everything true and honourable, with a lively sympathy towards others, her removal creates a void in a circle which memory can now alone supply. Her closing life was cheered by those views of Christian truth which give a promise of a life hereafter to all who believe and endeavour to practise the precepts of the gospel. Her remains, attended by her family, were interred in the Rosary Cemetery, Thorpe.

Oct. 1, aged 27 years, at Chowbent, BETSEY, daughter of the late Mr. James HART, of Bag Lane.

Oct. 5, at his residence, Carlton Terrace, St. Dunstan's, Canterbury, after a lingering sickness, borne with exemplary patience, JOHN LOVE, Esq., in the 58th year of his age. Of Nonconformist descent, Mr. Love was never unmindful, much less ashamed, of the root from which he sprung; and, though of an exceedingly modest and retiring disposition, he was always (and on fitting occasions) earnest in avowal and assertion of the principles in which he had not simply a traditional interest, but which enlisted also the warm sympathy of his understanding and his heart. In him the Unitarian cause at Canterbury has sustained a severe loss; for he was not only a steady, consistent and liberal supporter of the congregation assembling in the Blackfriars' chapel, but one whose life lent a lustre to the faith which he professed. What he believed to be true, he firmly maintained; what he felt to be right, he diligently practised; and the consolations of an upright course did not desert him in prospect of the last earthly change. The tranquillity of spirit and heartfelt trust in God's fatherly will,

—the "sweet and holy thoughts" that found utterance to those around him during his long illness,—strikingly evinced the depth, the sincerity and the efficacy of his religious convictions. In his family he leaves a vacancy which no other source can supply, for in his character the domestic affections were remarkably exemplified. To borrow the words of one whose former ministerial relations with the deceased afforded him ample means of observation and judgment, "His conduct as a son, brother, husband and father, was above all praise." His surviving kindred have, however, in their bereavement, the melancholy satisfaction of knowing that he is followed to the tomb by the profound regret of all who were privileged to come in contact with the probity, kindness and amiability which so prominently distinguished him. He was interred in the family vault in the cemetery of the Dissenters, Wincheap, on Thursday, the 10th of October.

Oct. 6, at 4, Ormonde Terrace, North Gate, Regent's Park, MARY JACKSON, aged 57.

Oct. 6, at Northampton, aged 102, Mrs. FRANCES LEIGH, daughter of Rev. Samuel King, formerly Dissenting minister at Welford, in the county of Northampton, and sister of the late Mrs. Horsey.

Oct. 11, by the accidental discharge of his gun, Mr. JOSEPH GRISBROOK, of Blackheath Terrace, Blackheath, well known as an extensive army contractor, linen and woollen draper, &c., occupying a vast range of premises as shops and warehouses in Powis Street, Woolwich.

Most just and honourable in all his dealings, an encourager of the young in the pursuit of whatever was good and worthy and intellectual, stern only where there was any deviation from rectitude, firm, yet kind and affectionate, he gained the esteem and respect of all who really knew him. The remark of one young man who had been in his employ twenty-one years, "that he had been as a father to him," and of a youth, that "he loved him as a father," was the general feeling towards him throughout his household. Society has lost one who would *act* as well as plan for its benefit; all who stood really in need found in him a certain friend and counsellor; but he acted out those words most truly, "Let not thy right hand know what the left hand doeth." To his relatives his loss is irreparable; he was their great comforter in sorrow or difficulty. Although himself childless, little children called him blessed; tender, loving and joyous, he joined in their sports with all the glee that young hearts like so to feel shared with them by their elders; indeed, he loved all things beautiful in nature. One of his great pleasures was a walk in the country, and nothing escaped his notice and admiration. A friend once remarked of him that he was a nobleman in the true sense of the word. He was brought up by the best of parents a Unitarian, and he never swerved from those principles; he abhorred cant and hypocrisy; *he* was a *Christian* in the most glorious sense, a true follower of Jesus. He would say, Why write this? for he never courted applause; yet it is well to speak of such a man. The writer of this feels that no words can describe his worth. He is the character that Montgomery's exquisite hymn represents:

"Go to the grave in all thy glorious prime,
In full activity of zeal and power;
A Christian cannot die before his time,
The Lord's appointment is the servant's hour."

On Thursday, the 17th, his remains were consigned to their resting-place in the cemetery adjoining the Presbyterian chapel, Tenterden, by Rev. E. Talbot, who most impressively conducted the service in presence of a large number of friends and the public who held the memory of the deceased in great respect; and on Sunday, the 20th, Mr. Talbot delivered a most excellent sermon from Romans xiv. 8, full of consolation and hope, derived from that holy faith in which, as Unitarians, we rejoice. M. J. B.

Tenterden, Oct. 1861.

Oct. 11, at 5, Ulster Terrace, Regent's Park, ANNE, widow of the late John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., in the 84th year of her age.

Oct. 11, at Newport, Isle of Wight, aged 49, ELIZABETH, the beloved wife of Robert PINNOCK, Esq., of that town. In giving a brief outline of the life of this highly-esteemed member of the congregation at Newport, who has been severed thus early from her attached family and friends, there are few especial incidents which would be interesting to the public, though there are very many which will be cherished in the memories, as long as memory shall last, of bereaved survivors. The great and prominent feature in her life was her daily and hourly devotion to the various duties which, in the providence of God, devolved upon her. She had a high conception of what *a home ought to be*, viz., the abode of virtue, affection and peace, and she

earnestly and nobly did her part in making her house such a home. Her management of children most strikingly displayed the power of parental gentleness and love. One who had the best opportunities for knowing her writes, "I never heard her once speak harshly to one of her children, or scarcely ever give utterance to anything like a command, yet she had their entire submission to her wishes." The same gentle influence was exercised over the business young people, and rarely did one leave her husband's employment without an expression of grateful thanks to her for her kindness and consideration. In time of sickness or distress she was truly a "ministering angel." Her calmness and fortitude, her watchful care and tender nursing, were beautiful and touching. In the midst of her cares and anxieties she not only frequently prayed herself, but taught her children to pray to their Heavenly Father. An extract from her funeral sermon, which was preached by the Rev. T. F. Thomas to a full congregation from Luke viii. 52, gives a just estimate of her character: "In the relations of home, in her maternal duties, in the offices of kindness and sympathy, and in the charities that soothe and heal and bless, she was eminently distinguished. With a mind stored with useful knowledge and with solid information on morals and religion, these produced their genuine fruits of calm, unmurmuring resignation to the will of God. With the double responsibility of a large family and household, yet how orderly, peacefully and kindly did she govern! Sternness and harshness were foreign to her nature. The principles by which she ruled at home were sound judgment and tender persuasion. Her simple religious faith, which had sustained and comforted her own soul throughout her long and severe affliction, she taught to her children, feeling assured that it would be found their best refuge amidst the disappointments and trials of life. While she lived, 'her children rose up and blessed her;' and now that she is taken away from them, they will hallow her memory and bless her even more for having left them a bright example to follow, a train of soothing and delightful reflections, and a treasure of glorious hopes." She is not dead, but sleepeth.

E. K.

Oct. 11, at Newbury, after a long and painful illness borne very patiently, FANNY, daughter of Mr. J. ILSLEY (secretary of the Unitarian congregation of that town), aged 25 years.

Oct. 17, at Lewisham, Kent, suddenly, Mr. THEOPHILUS DAVIES, B.A., aged 34, only son of the late Rev. Henry Davies, LL.D., of Gloucester.

Mr. Davies was educated for the Unitarian ministry at Manchester New College, where he passed with credit through the full course, and graduated B.A. in the first division at London University in the year 1847. His contemporaries in the same same class at Manchester were the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, of Glasgow, Richard Hutton, Esq., M.A., and the late R. H. Tayler, M.A. On leaving College in the year 1848, Mr. Davies for a few months occupied the pulpit at Gloucester, vacated by the sudden death of his father. A tendency towards ultra-rationalistic opinions and a marked distaste for the ministerial duties led him to withdraw from the pulpit, and for some time he was engaged as mathematical master in Mr. Kendall's school at Manchester, and subsequently as a private tutor. About four years ago, he obtained, through the strong recommendation of Miss Martineau, a responsible post in the *Daily News* office; and at the time of his death was rapidly rising into reputation as a literary man. The *National Review*, the *Economist* and the *Spectator* have at various times been enriched by valuable contributions from his pen. Mr. Davies's sermons when at college and during his brief ministry at Gloucester, were admired for their compressed thoughtfulness and chaste simplicity of style; and there is little doubt that if he had remained in the ministry and his views had become settled, he would have been an able and enlightened, if not a popular preacher. In the private intercourse of life he had a fund of quiet, genial humour, and won the strong attachment of those who were acquainted with the fine qualities of his manly character. He gave all who knew him the impression of possessing great natural ability; but a want of steady, persevering industry, and a constitutional distaste for work, prevented him from doing full justice to his latent powers.

Mr. Davies was married to the only surviving daughter of the late Rev. Henry Acton, of Exeter. Only a few weeks before his death he was rejoicing in the accession of domestic happiness occasioned by the birth of a son, and looking with new hope and higher purpose on the duties and responsibilities of life.

T. L. M.

Oct. 20, at her residence, Bowdon, Cheshire, in her 73rd year, Mrs. JOSEPH MASON, deeply respected and beloved by all who knew her.